UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + +

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

+ + +

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

+ + +

ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER 99 PUBLIC HEARING

+ + +

Monday, October 20, 1997

+ + +

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

+ + +

The public hearing convened on the 1st Floor, Alexander Hamilton Customs House, One Bowling Green, New York, New York at 10:00 a.m., John D. Hawke, presiding.

APPEARANCES:

GOVERNMENT PANEL

JOHN D. HAWKE, JR., Under Secretary for Domestic Finance

DONALD HAMMOND, Fiscal Service

LARRY STOUT, Financial Management

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES (Continued):

GOVERNMENT PANEL (Continued)

BEATRICE M. DISMAN, Social Security Administration

THOMAS G. STAPLES, Social Security
Administration

FRANK SULLIVAN, Department of Veterans' Affairs

WITNESS

THE HONORABLE ALFONSE D'AMATO, U.S. Senator, State of New York

CONSUMER ISSUES - PANEL #1

LUPE IVERY, ACORN

FLORENCE RICE, Harlem Consumer Education Council

SAM MILLER, Office of Manhattan Borough President

FINANCIAL SERVICES ISSUES - PANEL #2

ADAM COYLE, Western Union Financial Services

DAVID WARFIELD, Travelers Express Co.

SUE McCARTHY, New York State Credit Union League

DENNIS LEWIS, New York State Credit Union League

LISA DUNAY, Empire Corporate Federal Credit Union

MANUEL MIRABAL, National Puerto Rican Coalition

CONSUMER ISSUES - PANEL #3

FRANZ LEICHTER, New York State Senator

BETH FINKEL, Council on Aging

GENE BARRETT, AARP

SHIRLEY GENN, Council of the Aging, Inc.

JOSEPH WASHINGTON, O.N.E.

SOL GORELICK, New York Legislative Social Action Committee

CONSUMER ISSUES - PANEL #4

Hillary Botein, Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project

KATHARINE ROBERTS, Advocate

SAM MILLER, Office of the Manhattan Borough
President

MELVIN FAULKNER, Community Alliance for Youth Action, Inc.

CLIFFORD ROSENTHAL, National Federation of Community Development Credit Unions

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	PAGE
Presentation of the Honorable Alfonse D'Amato	9
Panel 1 Presentations:	
Florence Rice	19
Lupe Ivery	25
Sam Miller	32
Panel 2 Presentations:	
Adam Coyle	48
David Warfield	58
Sue McCarthy	65
Lisa Dunay	76
Manuel Mirabal	84
Panel 3 Presentations:	
Gene Barrett	112
Franz Leichter	117
Shirley Genn	121
Sol Gorelick	136
Beth Finkel	143
Reverend Joseph Washington	151
Panel 4 Presentations:	
Hillary Botein	169
Katharine Roberts	180
Melvin Faulkner	183
Clifford Rosenthal	189
Ruby Sills and Glen Miller	195

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MR. HAWKE: Good morning. I'm John Hawke, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Domestic Finance, and I'd like to welcome you all here today for this second in our series of public hearings on our proposed regulation to implement the new program that we call EFT 99, the federal government's fulfillment of the statutory mandate to make all payments electronically, all federal payments electronically by January 1, 1999.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and look forward to the information and insights that you will provide to us during this process.

This hearing is a major step in our public outreach during this rulemaking process, but I want to emphasize that the record will be open for a full 90 days, and that we are delighted to have statements for the record, even though there may not be an opportunity to present them here in person today.

During the last year alone, the Treasury has held meetings with over 100 interested stakeholders and their organizations. We are very

anxious to have input, and I'm pleased to be joined here this morning by other representatives of the government agencies that are involved in this process.

I want to welcome Beatrice Disman, who's the Regional Commissioner of the Social Security Administration. We have Tom Staples, Associate Commissioner for Financial Policy and Operations of the Social Security Administration; Don Hammond, who is to my immediate right, who's our Deputy Assistant Secretary for fiscal matters; and to my right, Larry Stout from the Financial Management Service, who's standing in for Commissioner Morris.

In writing these proposed regulations, and
I stress again that these are only proposed, the
Treasury Department met with numerous groups,
including consumer and community organizations, trade
organizations, vendors, financial institutions, and
other financial services providers to try to get as
much insight as possible into the issues that affect
these different groups and what electronic funds
transfer means to them and their constituents.

We made every attempt to adhere to four

basic, but crucial principles when we drafted this 1 2 proposal. 3 First, the transition from paper payments 4 to EFT should be accomplished with the interest of recipients being of paramount importance. 5 6 Second, that our policies should maximize sector competition for the business of 7 private 8 handling federal payments so that recipients not only 9 have a broad range of payment options, but also at reasonable cost with 10 their payments receive 11 substantial consumer protections and with the greatest 12 possible convenience, efficiency, and security. 13 Third, that recipients, and especially those having special needs, the elderly, individuals 14 15 with physical disabilities, and those living in remote or rural communities, should not be disadvantaged by 16 17 the transition to EFT. And finally, that the EFT 99 Program 18 should try to bring recipients without bank accounts 19 20 into the mainstream of the financial system. 21 With these criteria in mind, I would like

again to stress how essential your input is today and

throughout our comment period, which ends in mid-December.

A few housekeeping matters before we turn to our first witness. Our court reporter will record this entire session as a means of documenting today's proceedings, and within two weeks of the hearing, the testimony will be posted on the Treasury Department's EFT Web site for public review.

I would also like to thank the Customs House officials for the use of this great facility and the New York Federal Reserve Bank for the help of their professional staff in organizing the logistics of the hearing.

The hearing will proceed as follows. Our first witness will be the Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, Senator D'Amato, and following Senator D'Amato, we will have panels of representatives from consumer organizations and the financial services industry.

Let me now turn to our distinguished initial witness, Senator D'Amato, whom we have had the pleasure of working with extensively, not only on EFT

The Senator has already held at least one 1 99 issues. 2 hearing that we participated in exploring these 3 issues, and his insight into these issues is very 4 important to us as we go forward. Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome you 5 6 to the proceedings today. I must say this unusual turning of the tables today for me to be 7 presiding and for you to be the --8 9 SENATOR D'AMATO: You can ask me 10 questions. 11 MR. HAWKE: witness, but we're 12 delighted to have you with us today. 13 Thank you, sir. 14 SENATOR D'AMATO: Well, Secretary Hawke, 15 let me first say that I'm deeply appreciative of the sensitivity that you and the Department of Treasury 16 17 have exhibited and manifested not only by your words, 18 because words are easy in our business, but by way of 19 action. 20 I want to also thank you for accommodating the schedules that we all have, myself in particular, 21

and giving me this opportunity to be the lead off

witness.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And I might say I want to thank all of your colleagues for participating today, but particularly Beatrice Disman. I want to just take this opportunity to say that notwithstanding the incredible volumes, volumes and reams of requests that come through daily for clarification from people who have the greatest of problems, the disabled, those who have lost their spouses and have dependent children, those who are so dependent upon our Social Security system, that you and your people do day in and day out just a tremendous job, a great, great job.

Your responsiveness to the requests that we make or our office makes on behalf of literally thousands of people is second to none, second to none. You've got a great esprit de corps that your people have, and I just want to share that with you and let you know.

MS. DISMAN: Thank you so much, Senator.

SENATOR D'AMATO: Secretary Hawke, again,
we go back some time ago, five months ago, when the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Senate Banking Committee held hearings to consider the

implementation of EFT 99. I was besieged, and not even besieged, but rather, had a number of people who work very closely with many of the people who will be affected.

We're talking about ten million people who do not have banks, who don't utilized them; many language problems, consequently never opened up an account, most of them elderly, many disabled, veterans, non-veterans, some people with mental disabilities, et cetera, and that's why it is so important.

And when Congress passed legislation that said we wanted to save money by utilizing a system that would put the assets, the monies of people, into an account that would do away with the necessity of having to mail on a monthly basis and the question of lost checks, et cetera, and all of the costs attendant with those people who lose them or who are robbed, why, I think it was a good idea.

Having looked at the totality, I still believe we have an obligation to attempt to work with the unbank, but in a manner which gives to them the

ability to make decisions on the initial rules and regulations, and the pilot programs that were undertaken in Texas and Alabama dealing with unbank recipients did not have.

I was particularly concerned about the effect on these ten million, and understand we are not talking about insignificant sums of money. If, indeed, we talk about ten million people and an average of \$700 per check, some checks more, some checks less, using that as an example, we are then talking about \$7 billion a month. That's a lot of money.

And that's a lot of money that will be placed at the disposal, given that these are monies that do not go into a bank now regularly, that would regularly be deposited in various financial institutions.

Now, that is in no way a criticism of the financial institutions that would receive this, but it's just to put an idea as to what we're talking about, and I'm trying to do a little math here. That comes to \$84 billion a year. That's a lot of money,

\$84 billion.

So therefore, Mr. Secretary, when we talk about what should the cost of these transactions, because that's what we're talking about when we really break it right down, and I've got this wonderful, wonderful speech, and I want to thank my staff and Mr. Mondello, Joe Mondello, Jr., in particular, and I ask that the totality of my remarks be placed in the record as if read in their entirety.

MR. HAWKE: We will be pleased to do that.

SENATOR D'AMATO: And it will save us all some time.

But let's get right to it. If, indeed, the institutions are permitted to make charges for every withdrawal or almost every withdrawal that people make, I believe that would be unconscionable. I believe that would be wrong.

I think we have an obligation to say there are certain standards and limits that you cannot go above, and while we have made -- and I commend you for having made -- I say I'm especially pleased with the waiver positions which allow unbank recipients to

continue to receive paper benefit checks in the mail if they cannot get to a bank because of a physical disability or if there is not one within their region that they feel comfortable with, and these waivers are self-certifying. So people just have to say, and you will have a form for them, "I cannot or will not," or, "I'd appreciate your not having me have to use this particular bank."

That's good because the recipient automatically continues to get the paper benefits. There are some problems as it relates to the disabled, but one of the questions that has not -- and you have addressed that, and that's a major concern, and I thank you -- but I still have strong doubts, and I am extremely troubled about giving to the financial institutions the ability to impose, quote, only reasonable, reasonable fees.

What's a reasonable fee to someone who's imposing it may not be a reasonable fee to the people who are paying it, and I suggest to you that that should not be left to some kind of industry-wide standard, but with some degree of specificity we have

got to determine that before we go forward with this.

Understand, again, there are a number of other questions, and I'll just tick on some of them. What will the terms of the account be?

Will the account holder have access to the tellers in the bank? In other words, we're talking about elderly people. We're talking about people who have got disabilities. This is a major group. Will they be able to come in? Are they just going to have to use that machine to get their money out? Will they be able to come in and have a teller explain to them without additional cost or assist them?

Now, it seems to me that is reasonable. After all, again, we talk about \$7 billion-plus a month that banks will have deposited. They're not paying interest on that. Not every account is going to draw out all of that money every month. Indeed, I would suggest that some people would probably even accumulate it there, and again, that gets into a question of consumer education, what we can do to tell seniors how they can then use financial institutions in a manner in which they can help themselves.

But will they pay a fee to withdraw their money from an ATM? Are we going to give them, as was the case in Alabama and Texas, just one withdrawal without charging? I think that's absurd because to suggest that you only get one free withdrawal a month and thereafter you would have pay unconscionable. You're then saying to people, "Take all of your money out at one time in order to avoid a fee, " and these people are seniors. They're going to be probably taking their money out in rather small amounts.

We estimated by some surveys that under the loophole or under the guise of just having reasonable fees without being able to determine, it could cost a couple almost \$300 a month, husband and wife, or \$300 a year -- excuse me -- \$300 a year. That's a lot of money, \$300 a year, and it doesn't take long when you see how these fees can add on top of each other for accessing one's own account.

And the regulations that have been put forward today, and I understand that they are and that's why we have these hearings, the fees for this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

account will not be set by the government, and you have suggested, Treasury has suggested, listening to the banking industry for suggestions as it designs features of the account.

Well, I think that's important. We have to understand what their costs are, what their operations are, but I think before we go forward, we have to have more definiteness as to exactly what they can and what they can't charge.

Mr. Secretary, there are people here who will speak to the need of assuring this very vulnerable population, and we have a very substantial number of them right here in New York, and New York City in particular, that, while we want to provide them the opportunity to move into the modern era, it is not at their expense, and that the financial institutions of this country do have a social obligation as it relates to meeting the needs of their constituents.

And I am certain that with the Treasury being mindful of this, hopefully we can come into a situation where we don't see this population subject

to double fees, subject to excessive charges, and where there is a recognition of the tremendous assets that they will be placing into these institutions, the profits these institutions will be making, and that they should share in some of those benefits since it is their money, and we have an obligation to do that because this is a specifically vulnerable population and have identified them as being very vulnerable for a whole number of reasons.

I am deeply appreciative of the sensitivity that you have demonstrated to this subject and the manner in which you and the committee have responded, and I thank you.

MR. HAWKE: Mr. Chairman, we are deeply appreciative of your taking the time to be with us today, and you have raised, I think, exactly the right questions. These are the kinds of questions that we are going to be focusing on and that we hope to have widespread public comment on, and as we go forward with this, we hope we will be able to work very closely with you and your committee in fashioning a final regulation that will come up with the right

1	answers to all of the important questions that you've
2	raised.
3	We, again, thank you for taking the time
4	to be with us today, and we look forward to continuing
5	to work with you.
6	SENATOR D'AMATO: Well, thank you, Mr.
7	Secretary.
8	MR. HAWKE: Thank you, sir.
9	SENATOR D'AMATO: It was good being with
10	you.
11	MR. HAWKE: We'll now move into the next
12	panel.
13	Good. We welcome the members of the
14	panel, and, Ms. Rice, we'll start with you if you'll
15	start by identifying yourself, and then we'd be happy
16	to receive your statement.
17	I think there are four mics there.
18	MS. RICE: Let me say good morning, and
19	I'm just delighted that I have the privilege of being
20	here.
21	MR. HAWKE: Could you identify yourself,
22	Ms. Rice?

I'm Florence M. Rice, 1 MS. RICE: Yes. 2 President of the Harlem Consumer Education Council. 3 And many of the things that Senator 4 D'Amato said, I certainly support him on it. 5 PARTICIPANT: We can't hear you. 6 MS. RICE: Thank you. 7 I support him on it. I, Florence Rice, am deeply concerned as 8 9 an African American woman, being here over the years and recognizing that many of us African Americans 10 could never get a loan from any of these banks. 11 12 call it a windfall for the banks, and I have a pro and con because I recognize that certainly the technology 13 The government is certainly going to do 14 era is here. 15 what they see that they have to do. Many years ago, in '72, I sat and was in 16 17 meeting with A.D. Little where they had conference on the moneyless, checkless society. 18 thank God, I've lived and am beginning to see it 19 20 develop. 21 And so, therefore, I do have a written 22 I was supposed to have some to be able to statement.

give out. It hasn't gotten here yet.

So I say the electronic funds transfer, and I cannot tell you that I am for it or I'm against it, whether I agree or disagree of the future development of the electric fund age. However, I do recognize there are positive, as well as negative, effects that our seniors are disabled and other handicaps of our community shall receive from the electronic fund act.

Once again, I have seen over the years how the banks have destabilized our minority community by not making loans to the African Americans. The banks in their windfall bring the African American community once again to the crossroad of economic deprivation by the electronic funds transfer age.

I'm Florence Rice, again, represent many of the seniors and, again, the working class of the Harlem community, and I must say at this time I don't have a bank account. A few years ago I needed a coat, and when I looked at my bank statement, I had paid \$202 for fees. I couldn't afford a coat. So, therefore, I decided as of that year, I no longer

needed a bank account. 1 2 I do believe in the credit unions though. 3 As a consumer advocate, one of my main concerns are because I notice that ATMs 4 supermarkets, inferior products in the supermarkets, 5 6 will increase in prices preparing for those consumers 7 receiving government checks, which they do today in our communities, will pay more for products, will be 8 9 ripped off by dishonest merchants of the Harlem 10 community. 11 And when I speak about Harlem, I just 12 speak anywhere where African Americans, and I will put even where poor people live, 13 it this way: 14 regardless of race or color. 15 The overcharging rate for the usage of the 16

electronic funds transfer.

Also, monies made in the communities not being returned back into the community.

My concern also: where will the ATMs be Who will be eligible for a reasonable point of sale to be located on their premises? What cost will be charged on the transactions? And I think many

17

18

19

20

21

others will question that.

Will those costs be higher or lower than those charges by existing check cashing outlets? And I want to say this in behalf of the check cashing company, yet I don't think I've ever cashed my check in a check cashing, but in fact, at one time they're the only people that would cash our checks, and again, I've come down the road of life. I'm 78. I can remember when African Americans were not welcome in the bank, not to cash a check anyway, or if not, they always treated us like we were criminals.

Will those costs be higher or lower than those charged by existing check cashing outlets?

What is the procedure to be adopted for recipients to obtain access card? Is it possible to give the community a description of that procedure?

If EFT is considered to be an example of financial hardship based on physical disability, recipients to be eligible for a waiver.

Could points of sales, ATMs, be located in senior citizen centers?

And I also want to say and give credit to

Franz Leichter, who many years, in fact, I'm generally 1 2 contact with Leichter, Senator in Franz Franz 3 Leichter, because he is someone that I could always 4 express the way I feel about banking. I think what I would like to say here and 5 end it here is I think in 1985, and I might be wrong 6 on the date, the American bankers, and my theme then 7 was for poor people, who needed the banks, and right 8 9 now I'd say that, even though overall I know that it's coming, and people will get used to it. 10 For many senior citizens, ATMs, unless 11 12 there's a real effort to inform and educate these 13 people, it's like a frightening thing, and then, again, once a system is set up, then you have on the 14 15 other end people who sit there to scheme in how they can obtain that funds from those people. 16 17 So I think with that I would say thank you for giving me the privilege of speaking today. 18 MR. HAWKE: Ms. Rice, thank you for being 19 20 with us today, and we appreciate the thought that went 21 into your remarks.

Our next speaker is?

1 MS. IVERY: Lupe Ivery. 2 MR. HAWKE: Lupe Ivery. 3 MS. IVERY: Good morning. My name is Lupe 4 Ivery. I'm a member of ACORN. ACORN has over 100,000 low and moderate 5 6 income, mostly minority member families in cities 7 across the United States. Many of our members and neighbors are looking at EFT with great concern. 8 EFT is a great opportunity to establish 9 banking relationships for the ten million people that 10 11 don't have bank accounts. That's something ACORN has 12 been working very hard on for a very long time to 13 achieve, but ten million people don't have bank accounts for very good reasons, and forcing this issue 14 15 could hurt them. So the Treasury Department has to be careful about how it writes the plan for EFT. 16 17 As I just said, EFT can be the way our people finally get bank accounts. This would be a 18 very big help to many families. 19 I have a bank 20 I got it because I was a federal employee and was offered a special deal. I opened it for free 21

and have direct deposit and free checks.

22

It makes my

life easier. It helps me save money, and it's impressive to people I have to do business with.

But now my nieces can't afford a bank account. Instead they have to go to check cashers and pay someone to get their money. That's not right. Sometimes I can cash their checks and write checks for them so they can have their money and pay their bills, but they should be able to do this for themselves. They should be able to have their own bank accounts because with EFT, the Treasury Department has the power to make this happen.

The Treasury Department shouldn't be afraid of asking banks to do their part. In the government's pilot program in Texas, Citibank has a 50 percent return on investment from its electronic accounts. That's before you count how much they made on interest from the money they were holding for people.

Citibank made so much money that both the Social Security Administration and the Texas Bank Commissioner complained about how much money they charged people.

Between the profit that banks make and the 1 2 hundreds of millions of dollars the Treasury 3 Department will save from using EFT, people can be 4 helped into bank accounts. 5 But the Treasury Department's current plan 6 isn't much good for doing that. What Treasury has to 7 do is make sure banks and check cashiers don't combine where they would have to charge double for only the 8 9 same service. 10 The Treasury Department also has to make 11 sure banks treat the like full new customers 12 customers. 13 Third, the public education campaign has to include community groups fully in the education 14 15 effort. Apparently the Treasury Department wants 16 17 people to do one of four things. If they have a bank 18 account, then they must tell the Treasury Department 19 to electronically deposit their checks into that bank 20 account, but ten million people who get a federal 21 check don't have bank accounts, and they have to do

something else.

The Treasury Department gives these people 1 2 three other choices. They can go out and get a bank 3 In some cases they can waive themselves out 4 of the law to get an account. 5 If they don't do any of those things, then the Treasury Department will give them an account 6 called the electronic transfer account. 7 All of these options have problems for our 8 9 people. First, everybody can't get a bank account. If people could get bank accounts easily, then there 10 wouldn't be ten million people without bank accounts. 11 12 The people can't get bank accounts, and 13 for a lot of reasons. Some banks ask you for a lot of money to open the account. Some put long holds on the 14 15 money you deposit. Some ask you to keep a minimum balance. Often there are a lot of expensive fees that 16 17 go along with the account. 18 banks do all of these things. 19 Whether the Treasury Department tells you to get an 20 account or not, these things are going to keep you from getting that account. Expecting people to get 21

bank accounts just because you say so is a false

expectation.

But you can't expect letting them go to check cashers will be any better. Check cashers don't charge a lot of money for those other services, but check cashers don't give you those other services, and they charge you to cash your check.

In asking people to get accounts at banks, check cashers or whatever exists out there now, the Treasury Department is asking people to open up their wallets to a vacuum cleaner so that the government can save 40 cents a check. We at ACORN have a huge problem with that.

What the Treasury Department should be doing is making sure these accounts don't rob us. The Treasury Department has the power to do it. The law says that the Treasury Department must insure that individuals required to have an account at a financial institution have access to such an account at a reasonable cost and are given the same consumer protections as other account holders.

We ask that you use this power to make sure we get necessary financial services at affordable

prices in the private market.

The Treasury Department says it will also let people ask for a waiver from the law, but the Treasury Department won't give all of the waivers it needs to give. It won't have to get an account if the account costs too much or if it's hard to get to the account because the bank is too far.

I also won't have to get an account if I have a physical disability, but if I already have an account, then I won't be able to get any of these waivers. If I lose my job or move or get hurt in an accident and the account isn't useful anymore, then I should be able to close the account and get a check.

The Treasury Department ought to change that part of the waiver plan.

The Treasury Department should also include more waivers. If someone has a mental disability, then it may be too hard to use an electric account. The same goes if they don't speak the language or can't read.

In fact, these are some of the problems that force many people to turn to the government for

help. We shouldn't be making these problems barriers to getting help.

The most important thing the Treasury Department can do is make the ETAs adequate to meet the needs of the ten million people without bank accounts. As I said earlier, many people won't have the other options to use and will be forced into the electronic transfer accounts.

any different than you. We need to pay bills by check or money order. We need to save money for emergencies. We need to be able to walk into a bank lobby to get help when we need to. We need all of these things, and we need it at prices we can afford.

The Treasury Department will be bargaining with banks to get their service for the ten million unbanked families out there. We're only here because the Treasury Department wants to save money. It ought to share the good fortune with the ten million affected by the law and get good, affordable accounts.

Please develop the plan so that it's helpful to all of us. ACORN is here to help you do

1 that. 2 Thank you. 3 MR. HAWKE: Thank you very much. 4 Mr. Miller. MR. MILLER: Good morning. My name is Sam 5 6 Miller. I'm a policy analyst in the Office of 7 Manhattan Borough President, Ruth Messenger. Thank you for allowing me to testify on her behalf. 8 9 The Electronic Transfer of Federal Benefits Program promises to simplify and safeguard 10 the receipt of federal benefits for millions of New 11 12 Yorkers. Moreover, EFT 99 promises to save the 13 Treasury Department millions of dollars in processing 14 fees. 15 The Borough President shares these worthy goals with you. 16 However, the vagueness of 17 department's proposed rules on EFT 99 raises several 18 questions that need to be answered before mandatory 19 electronic transfers are implemented in New York and 20 other states. 21 For example, the proposed rules indicate

that waivers will be granted to benefit recipients who

can certify that their physical disability or geographic situation would make electronic transfers impractical.

This idea makes sense, but it is not explicit enough. Physical disability should be certified according to definitions set forth by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Moreover, recipients with certified mental illness, language barriers, and literacy deficiencies should also qualify for waivers. These conditions might make electronic transfers a hardship for many people, particularly senior citizens.

More explicit rules regarding the electronic transfer accounts themselves are also needed. It is unclear, for example, what the Treasury Department will accept as a reasonable cost for using ETA cards, as other witnesses have said. This is an important question for recipients who live on fixed incomes, particularly as more and more automated teller machines begin to charge transaction fees.

The department should work with New York and other states to insure that all EFT recipients

have access to affordable ATMs.

Currently many recipients lack easy access to affordable ATMs because red lining has deprived their neighborhoods of regular banking institutions. The Treasury Department is right to insist that recipients without bank accounts establish ETAs in federally insured institutions. This will protect recipients from inflated fees and provide consumer protections against lost ETA cards.

However, the department should extend these same protections to recipients who already have bank accounts.

Along these lines, the Treasury Department should take steps to insure that electronically transferred federal benefits are protected from judgment creditors, such as hospitals. Fear of judgment prevents many low income recipients from opening bank accounts because banks do not always protect federal benefits against judgment, even though they must by law.

Enforcement of this law must be increased, and funds in ETAs must also be vigorously protected

from judgment.

Before closing my brief testimony, the Borough President wants to reiterate a point that I hope this testimony has made clear, namely, that the burden for making EFT 99 work effectively should rest on the Treasury Department and the banks, not the recipients of federal benefits.

Given the relative scarcity of full service banking in many neighborhoods, the onus must be on the banks to make electronic transfers practical and safe. Perhaps EFT 99 should be included as one of the yardsticks by which we rate banks according to the Community Reinvestment Act. Those institutions that implement EFT 99 well should receive points under CRA. Conversely, those that do not should have points detracted from their CRA scores.

Thank you for allowing me to testify. The Borough President hopes that the Treasury Department will continue to hear testimony even after the rules are promulgated so that New York and other states can implement EFT 99 to everybody's benefit.

Thank you very much.

MR. HAWKE: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

I want to thank all of the witnesses for their thoughtful statements. You've certainly raised a great many of the questions that we ourselves have been grappling with, and we appreciate your input.

Before I open it up to the panel to see if there are any other questions, I just wanted to say, Mr. Miller, with respect to one point that you made about tightening up the definition of physical disability, we gave some thought to that, and we would, frankly, rather go in the other direction, to let individuals decide on their own standards whether they have a physical disability rather than force them to measure their circumstances against some other kind of complicated definition.

We want to try to make the invocation of waivers as easy as possible for individuals, and so if an individual has a physical hardship, some physical barrier or a geographic barrier, that is, or a physical problem, we're perfectly content to allow them to define that essentially in their own terms rather than force them to deal with some complicated

definition. 1 2 Right. MR. MILLER: 3 HAWKE: I think we have the same 4 objective. 5 MR. MILLER: Yes, right. I think that 6 makes sense. It's just the Borough President is 7 concerned because in previous debates about benefits, at times it seems like the definition of disability 8 9 has been narrowed, and the Borough President doesn't 10 want to see that happen, again, in this decision. 11 MR. HAWKE: We want to take a broad and 12 comfortable approach toward all of these waivers and 13 really leave it up to the individuals to determine 14 whether on a broadly stated standard whether they 15 think they're eligible. As long as those suggestions 16 MR. MILLER: 17 by the individuals are accepted by banks. 18 Well, it will be accepted by MR. HAWKE: 19 the program agencies who are making the payments, and our intent is that the individual's self-certification 20 will be dispositive, that there's not going to be any 21

after-the-fact checking or any recriminations.

22

Ιt

will be up to the individual to tell us whether they 1 2 are entitled to a waiver, and that will be the end of 3 it. 4 We think that's the only way that this can work in a fair and efficient manner. 5 Let me ask if there are any questions or 6 7 comments from other members of the panel. MR. HAMMOND: Ms. Rice, in your statement 8 9 you mentioned that a favorable disposition or whatever 10 to the services that credit unions may provide, and I 11 wanted to follow up and just say: do you find that 12 credit unions are well located in your community and convenient for the area in which you live? 13 MS. RICE: I have to answer yes and no on 14 15 I belonged to a credit union for a period of that. I think many of the churches or some of the 16 17 churches have credit unions. Credit unions something that most people don't seem to be fully 18 They're not, I don't think. 19 aware of. They're not, 20 you know, well known in the community. 21 Probably a list needs to be distributed 22 that people would know. It's education really.

MR. HAMMOND: And some of the churches, 1 2 you say, have credit unions? 3 MS. RICE: Yes, yes. We have a few of the 4 churches. I know St. Phillips, for one, Canaan Baptist, and that's about it, but I do know that there 5 6 are a few churches that have credit unions. 7 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. 8 MR. HAWKE: Larry. 9 MR. STOUT: The focus of the attention 10 that we have had so far today has been on the unbank community, and rightly so, but one of the things we're 11 12 going to have to work with is there will be at least 13 the same number or slightly more individuals who 14 currently have a relationship with a financial 15 institution, but continue to get a check from the federal government. 16 17 And I was wondering as a panel if you 18 could give us some perspective as to the kind of 19 issues and the kinds of things we're going to need to 20 be aware of in trying to move those individuals who already have that relationship, to move from a check 21

to an electronic deposit.

1	MS. RICE: It's hard for me to speak on
2	that. I think what some of the people that I have
3	spoken to, again, what bothers a lot of people even
4	though they have bank accounts is how quickly someone
5	else has an opportunity to reach into your bank
6	account and snatch out without informing you.
7	I have two cases where people's bank
8	account was gone into. The bank didn't inform them,
9	nobody, but still they removed that money, and some of
10	it was the government's money.
11	So in fact, I'm surprised I didn't have it
12	in here, but that is a concern, and especially in poor
13	communities because rights in the poor community is
14	always ignored because most people don't know their
15	rights.
16	MR. STOUT: Mr. Miller, did you want to
17	respond?
18	MR. MILLER: I don't have anything.
19	MR. STOUT: Okay.
20	MS. IVERY: I am concerned also that all
21	of the banks that close their branch office, that you
22	know, now you have to commute to a larger area, really

commute out of your neighborhood. I would like those 1 2 branches to open up again, to continue their service 3 before they became automated. You know, a lot of branches have closed 4 up, gone to the main office, and now the community has 5 6 not bank. Are they going to reopen again? 7 MS. RICE: I can tell you. All of this money that's 8 MS. IVERY: 9 coming in, that should be, you know, kind of like an incentive to open up again, open the branch offices. 10 They're bankers. They won't 11 MS. RICE: 12 change, and the whole thing is --13 MS. IVERY: Well, maybe that should be one 14 of the rules. You know, open up a branch office or 15 there's quite a few branch offices that closed up in the area where I live. I live out in Queens, and you 16 17 know, you have to commute to go to a bank, and if 18 you're going to kind of enforce that everybody get 19 direct deposit, then open up the branch office that 20 you can go to in your neighborhood. 21 MR. HAWKE: Are there ATMs that are 22 conveniently located?

I don't use it. 1 MS. IVERY: 2 That's the problem. MS. RICE: We don't 3 use them. 4 MR. HAWKE: Any other comments? 5 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not from the Department 6 of Treasury. I'm from a program agency in the federal government, Department of Veterans' Affairs, and we've 7 been really concentrating for the most part -- the 8 9 unbanked is a very small part of the beneficiaries we 10 deal with -- and we've been concentrating on those 11 that have bank accounts. 12 Recently, over the last year, we have made 13 a significant increase of around 15 percent since we went on a campaign, and one of the reasons we're 14 15 really pushing hard on this, too, is because we experience around 10,000 claims for lost or stolen 16 17 checks, and you know, we owe it to our beneficiaries 18 to provide alternatives to try to protect them from that type of thing, as well as in our interest on the 19 20 government's side, because there is a cost. 21 Wе maintain, Treasury and VA,

most agencies, maintain expensive,

department,

as

large claims processing, loss claims processing 1 2 So if we could get more participation on systems. 3 EFT, that's to our benefit. 4 So the question I have to you: to go 5 after these, you know, we use, to promote this EFT and 6 direct deposit, we use different programs like direct mailers with enrollment forms, call-in numbers, and 7 8 even asking payees to visit their banks. Do you have 9 any suggestions for any other means we can go out 10 there and promote EFT for those that have bank 11 accounts? 12 MR. MILLER: You can go to places like senior centers in places like New York and other 13 14 cities. 15 PARTICIPANTS: We can't hear you. 16 MR. MILLER: Sorry. I'm saying you can go to senior centers, you know, places --17 18 MS. RICE: Churches. MR. MILLER: Churches, synagogues. 19 20 just leapt to mind. Senior centers particularly are a main part of the senior network here in New York 21 22 City, and they're in virtually every neighborhood.

they're good sources of information and good places to give out information.

MS. RICE: Could I? I think one of the things that I would like to see, I would like to see, if you're really reaching down into the community, in my community, which is New York, it's a diverse community, and right now I do consumer education, but my problem is that there's not enough information in different languages. So, therefore, people don't understand, and it makes it very, very difficult for me, who doesn't speak any language, to be out there.

So what I suggest, I would like to see some of the material in comic books, in languages that people can understand, and because I'm thinking of the people who are poor, some who are illiterate, who can't read, and if we're saying that we're forcing people to use a system that they don't know anything about, then you prepare so those people will at least begin to understand and to be handed to those people.

I do get very annoyed with a lot of material I get, but it's not in Spanish. It's not in French, Haitian. So, therefore, I'm just saying they

don't know, and they are terrified to know that they are going to be forced to use the ATM.

One of the things I'd like to say with the have-nots, I heard somebody speak about the Web. I don't even have a computer. So I can't get to the Web. In poor communities, many of us don't have that. So you're really forcing people to maybe even commit crimes that would automatically be developed because they don't know, and that's my concern.

Put out material. The government puts out terrible material, let me tell you. So, therefore, you go back there. We're moving to those communities where you get African Americans. You get grassroot Dominican or Latino people. Get the kind of people that can reach those people and put that material out. Otherwise it's going to be a fiasco, and I'll tell you I will lead the fight against it.

MS. DISMAN: Florence, if I may comment, certainly in Social Security I think we have understood and have attempted to reach that, and I just want to comment to Treasury and the other benefit programs, that certainly when we implemented the

welfare reform legislation, there were six major languages that we printed our fact sheets in and had them in the community, and we think that was very significant for outreach in order to be able to do that.

We focused on that, and we did our community outreach groups. We heard exactly what you were saying as to basic facts, and so that as we have new legislation, we are focusing also to put it into the languages as well.

MR. HAWKE: I want to make clear that our public education campaign is going to be multilanguage, as well, and we intend to work with communities on exactly the sort of thing that you were describing, that is, making sure we know the best way to get to constituents that have different language skills.

MS. RICE: All right. One more thing then. I understand that the OCA, the federal level, is going to be eliminated. I'd say that agency has helped me to put out more material for poor people than any other agency that I'm in contact with. So

1	you can carry it back to the President, that I would
2	like to see that agency continue, and the Senator, I
3	will speak to him.
4	MR. HAMMOND: Are you speaking of the
5	Office of Consumer Affairs?
6	MS. RICE: Consumer Affairs, yes.
7	MR. HAMMOND: I will tell you that I
8	didn't know they were slated for elimination, but we
9	have met with Ms. Byrd, who is the head of the Office
10	of Consumer Affairs
11	MS. RICE: She'll be here next week.
12	MR. HAMMOND: talking about public
13	education.
14	MS. RICE: Yeah, well, I'm fighting to
15	keep it open. Whether I can or not I don't know. So
16	I can use your help.
17	MR. HAWKE: I want to thank all of the
18	panel members. This has been very helpful, and we'll
19	take a very short break before going on to the next
20	panel, and I want to remind everybody that there's
21	coffee and refreshments available just outside the
22	hearing room.

1	We'll reconvene here in ten minutes.
2	(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)
3	MR. HAMMOND: Hello, again. I'd like to
4	welcome everybody back to our third panel of the day,
5	and this panel is composed of Adam Coyle from Western
6	Union Financial Services; David Warfield, the Director
7	of New Business for Travelers Express; Sue McCarthy
8	from the New York State Credit Union League; Lisa
9	Dunay, who is the Director of Quality Assurance for
LO	Empire Corporate Federal Credit Union; and our fifth
L1	panelist this morning is Manuel Mirabal, who is the
L2	President of the National Puerto Rican Coalition.
L3	I'd like to welcome you all this
L4	afternoon.
L5	Mr. Coyle.
L6	MR. COYLE: Thank you.
L7	Good morning. My name is Adam Coyle. I'm
L8	based in Englewood, Colorado, and I'm counsel for
L9	Western Union Financial Services.
20	I appreciate and welcome the opportunity
21	to appear before you this morning to discuss the
22	proposed Treasury Department regulations implemented

the Data Collection Improvement Act of 1996.

In light of the ambitious number of speakers that the panel is looking to get through today, I'm going to try to abbreviate my comments. However, the full text of my testimony has been submitted for the record.

As a major financial institution with over 46,000 money transfer payment instrument agent locations throughout the United States and over 14,000 locations in 140 countries worldwide, Western Union is understandably interested in the implementation of EFT 99.

With a history that dates back to 1851, Western Union offers consumer money transfer services, money orders, and other payment products. We target our services to individuals without traditional banking relationships and to ex patriots who need to spend money to their country of origin, what we refer to as the cash based society, as well as traditional bank customers in need of rapid money transfer services or safe and reliable payment instruments.

What is the cash based society? The U.S.

Treasury Department acknowledges that nearly 20 percent of the 54 million federal benefits recipients, some ten million people, lack any account at a bank or other depository institution.

In addition to this unbank population, there's a sizable population of under-bank individuals today, people who maintain monthly bank balances of \$200 or less.

Western Union specializes in providing affordable, safe, and reliable financial services to this sizable population. Last year alone, Western Union and its affiliates issued or processed over 35 million money transfers and 235 million money orders. We also make 58 million public utility payments on behalf of our customers.

We believe that over time we have developed and now possess the skills and attributes needed to serve this diverse and demanding customer base. However, most importantly, we understand the needs of the cash based society. We understand that they don't necessarily want to be banked.

We also understand the banked services

often aren't available to these individuals. For example, members of the cash based society often live in rural areas or low and moderate income neighborhoods. As a result, there's typically an absence of conveniently located financial institution offices, including ATMs, near their homes or places of employment.

Western Union has developed an extensive network of independent businesses as agents to provide convenient access to financial payment products and services near where our customers live and work. Our agent base includes over 11,000 supermarkets, 3,000 pharmacies, and private transportation providers, like Greyhound Bus Lines.

Unlike most financial institutions, these Western Union agents are often open up to 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

For many of our customers English is a second language, one in which they may lack proficiency. As a result, Western Union actively recruits agents who are fluent in the language of their neighborhood, including, for example, Spanish,

Russian, Farsi, Chinese, Korean, Polish, and Hindi. 1 2 In addition, unlike ATMs that may only 3 dispense \$20 bills, at a Western Union agent office, 4 a customer can receive a cash payout of any amount in 5 precise dollars and cents. 6 While Western Union consistently provides prompt, convenient, and reliable services in a highly 7 competitive manner, we are also mindful of the fact 8 9 that the rapidly evolving electronic payment structure presents new challenges for us, our customers, and, 10 11 indeed, government regulators as well. 12 Of course, the first challenge that we all 13 share is the implementation of the DIA, and I wish to publicly commend officials of the staff of 14 15 Treasury Department for their efforts in this regard. The task of crafting and implementing regulations is 16 17 a formidable one. 18 Unfortunately, Union Western was disappointed by the proposed revisions to 12 CFR, Part 19

20

21

expeditious and cost efficient manner.

Our disappointment primarily stems from the account requirements set forth in the proposed Section 208.6. Section 208.6 provides that all federal payments made by electronic funds transfer must be deposited into an account in an FDIC insured depository institution or credit union in the name of the recipient.

Aside from certain hardship waivers, the proposed regulations recognize only two exceptions to this account requirement: payments to authorized payment agents, which is defined in the regulation to mean the same thing as a representative payee, and direct transfers to investment accounts established by registered brokers or dealers.

On more than one occasion Western Union has requested that the Treasury Department consider expanding the authorized payment agent definition to include licensed money transmission businesses. This would enable benefits recipients to designate Western Union or other similarly situated entities as their authorized payment agent.

In turn, Western Union would establish an individual fiduciary account at an insured depository institution for the benefit of such recipients from which funds could be made available to those recipients at any of the 36,000 Western Union agent locations worldwide. Such arrangement would be eligible for deposit insurance and would be subject to federal consumer protection laws, including Regulation 8.

This would be similar to the proposed broker-dealer exemption contained in Section 208.6(b), which permits federal payments to be deposited into an investment account maintained in the broker-dealer's name.

The notice of proposed rulemaking permitting expressed concern about the electronic transfer of federal benefits into controlled third party account bу а Specifically, you questioned exposing benefits recipients to the potential failure of such third parties to honor their obligations and the lack of federal oversight of such fiduciary arrangements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We believe that the Treasury's concerns are not well founded in the case of Western Union and many other potential authorized agents. Western Union and other money transmitters operating on a national scale are particularly well suited to qualify as authorized payment agents because of their numerous agent locations and their experience in providing financial services to the cash based society.

Moreover, Western Union is subject to comprehensive regulation and licensing. Forty-three states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico currently have sale of checks or money transmission laws which require money transmitters to obtain a license prior to engaging in such businesses.

Western Union is also subject to regulation on the federal level under the Bank Secrecy Act and the Money Laundering Control Act of 1986. The Bank Secrecy Act requires Western Union to maintain certain records, verify the identity of customers and file certain currency transaction reports.

In addition, the Money Laundering Suppression Act will require Western Union to register

with the Treasury Department as a money services business.

For the foregoing reasons, we believe that a direct, active participation of Western Union in EFT 99 does not present any of the policy concerns expressed in the proposed regulations with respect to third party of fiduciary accounts. Clearly, and particularly in view of the longstanding service commitment that Western Union has shown to federal benefits recipients, Western Union should be accorded parity with broker-dealers.

It seems ironic that an account structure that is available to wealthy Social Security recipients with brokerage accounts is not available to persons that cannot afford such accounts.

feel strongly that bу requiring virtually all federal payments to be deposited into in the recipient accounts the name οf competition for the delivery of needed financial services will be significantly inhibited. above, there are significant numbers of financial intermediaries and fiduciaries that are fully capable

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of providing enhanced services to the under-bank and cash based society.

By proposing a rule that diminishes rather than stimulates competition, the proposed regulation ignores one of the primary goals of the Debt Collection Improvement Act, which is to make accounts available to under-bank recipients at a reasonable cost.

While the law also requires that such accounts are given the same consumer protections as other account holders, it sadly does not mandate that federal benefits recipients should have access to their accounts at convenient locations in the neighborhoods where they live and work, such as Western Union could provide.

In summary, we believe that EFT 99 cannot be viewed in a vacuum. Its implementation must be considered against the backdrop of the unprecedented development of electronic commerce in the application of new financial products, services and delivery systems.

While members of the cash based society

1	are usually not present among the community of early
2	adapters, the new and different ways in which
3	financial services are to be made available in the
4	future will nevertheless ultimately affect them. EFT
5	99 is merely symptomatic of the profound changes to
6	come. It is, therefore, inadvisable to structure the
7	delivery of federal payments based solely on the
8	existing infrastructure.
9	I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to
10	appear before you this morning, and I will be happy to
11	answer questions when the panel is finished.
12	Thank you.
13	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Mr.
14	Coyle.
15	Our next witness this morning would be Mr.
16	Warfield.
17	MR. WARFIELD: Good morning. My name is
18	Dave Warfield, and I am the Director of New Business
19	Development for Travelers Express Company based in
20	Minneapolis, Minnesota. I appreciate and welcome the
21	opportunity to testify at this hearing.
22	I, too, have abbreviated my comments, but

submitted a full text.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Travelers Express is a leading provider of payment services and one of the nation's largest issuers of money orders. The department has invited comments specifically on the role of nonfinancial institutions in the delivery of federal benefits to recipients who do not have bank accounts with a depository institution. Travelers Express would like address that issue and demonstrate the to compelling non-bank financial argument that institutions should be an authorized payment agent for the electronic delivery of such benefits if the nonbank financial institution is a state licensed money transmitter and it is partnering with a federally insured financial institution.

Travelers Express sells its money orders independently owned and operated retail merchants and financial institutions, including convenience stores, grocery stores, gas check cashers, credit unions, and banks. Express money orders are sold through approximately 4,500 44,000 financial institution retail and

locations nationwide.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In 44 states, the issuance and sale of money orders is regulated by state law and administered by the State Banking Department. In order to obtain a license to sell checks or transmit money, a non-bank financial institution must financial bond, provide extensive and post operations information, maintain certain capital and liquidity requirements, file quarterly and annual reports, undergo on-site compliance examinations, and in a significant number of states invest outstanding balances in highly rated liquid investments.

These laws were enacted to insure the safety, security and soundness of companies which hold large amounts of customers' money pending the clearing of a check or money order, and Travelers Express maintains a rigorous compliance effort involving all levels of the company.

Travelers Express is also subject to regulation at the federal level under the Bank Secrecy Act, which was adopted to combat money laundering.

Millions of ordinary Americans purchase

and use money orders daily to conduct their financial affairs. Travelers Express strives to effectively serve consumers who have a legitimate reason not to maintain a bank account, providing a vital necessity of enabling such customers to transact their business safety and without the use of cash.

While surveys show that cost and minimum balance requirements are sometimes a factor, access to a bank, the perceived lack of financial privacy, and need for an account are also cited. As one of the nation's leading money order companies serving the needs of these individuals, Travelers Express has nationwide access to the very individuals that the concerned department is most about reaching: recipients who do not have and may prefer not to open a bank account.

In 1996, Travelers Express processed over 750 million transactions with a face amount of over \$90 billion. We also processed over 25 million utility payments on behalf of our customers.

Our company retains retail merchants who are well positioned to serve the very population which

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is disinclined to establish a traditional banking relationship.

Section 208.6 of the proposed regulations only recognizes two exceptions to the requirements that federal payments be made by electronic funds transfer into an account at an FDIC insured depository institution. Travelers Express believes strongly that state licensed money transmitters also be defined as an authorized agent.

Treasury clearly recognizes that nonfinancial institutions will have the opportunity to partner with financial institutions in the delivery of federal payments. Travelers Express commends the department for recognition of this opportunity and for acknowledgement of the development of this market. Providing access to federal benefits to those who favor or for whatever reason do not have a banking relationship would be a natural extension of our business.

However, Travelers Express believes that direct participation of a state licensed money transmitter in EFT 99 as a defined authorized agent is

clearly warranted. As I mentioned earlier, licensed money transmitters are subject to very strict regulatory oversight, as well as to investment and liquidity restrictions. Financial institutions who partner with a licensed money transmitter will gain access to a significantly extended branch network reaching geographic areas where the unbanked are located and reducing the number of waivers based on geographic barriers.

Specifically defining licensed money transmitters partnering with a financial institution as an authorized agent would significantly expand the competitive marketplace for providing access to benefit recipients.

The Travelers Express retail locations would, in fact, serve as an extended branch network where a federal benefit recipient can open an account with our financial institution partner. Such an arrangement would permit an unbanked benefit recipient to receive cash at the time of access to the funds.

Travelers Express recognizes the Treasury

Department's sensitivity to the issue of cost of

access to benefits. Over 90 percent of our money order business is to a significant extent generated by individuals who do not have a bank account and who are extremely price sensitive.

The average cost of a Travelers Express money order is about 75 cents. While we have not yet determined what the cost of this service would be, we envision it to entail a monthly account maintenance charge. Clearly disclosure, however, of charges both in the application and at the place of access would be mandatory.

Travelers Express urges Treasury to recognize that the costs of compliance with Regulation E will drive up the total cost of account maintenance and access, and that less stringent alternatives for ETA accounts should be considered.

In conclusion, Travelers Express fully recognizes the difficulties of designing a framework to accomplish the directives of the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, especially in light of the diversity of benefit recipients both culturally and socioeconomically. Allowing flexibility in the

structuring of benefit accounts, while at the same 1 2 time requiring safety and soundness standards, will 3 encourage broader participation by benefit recipients 4 and will foster competition and innovation by service 5 providers. 6 The result will not only be the expected 7 savings to the federal government from the transition to electronic delivery of benefit payments, but the 8 9 ultimate goal of efficient, inexpensive, secure, and readily available access by benefit recipients. 10 11 Travelers Express is very pleased to have 12 had the opportunity to present our testimony at 13 today's public hearing. As always, we would be most with Department 14 happy to meet of Treasury 15 representatives at any time to discuss our comments or the concerns of the industry. 16 17 Thank you. 18 Thank you very much, Mr. MR. HAMMOND: Warfield. 19 20 Our next speaker this morning is Ms. McCarthy. 21 22 MS. McCARTHY: Good morning. Thank you.

My name is Sue McCarthy. I'm the Vice President of Member Services at the New York State Credit Union League, and joining me today and sitting behind me is Dennis Lewis, our Senior Vice President of Business Operations. He's here so he might help answer some questions that any of you have.

We are pleased to present on behalf of the credit unions comments and concerns we share in regards to the implementation of the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996. The New York State Credit Union League is the principal trade association for over 650 state and federally chartered credit unions throughout New York. A total of 1,700 credit unions located in New York, Vermont, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Delaware have access to products and services provided through the New York League's affiliated companies.

We would like to take this opportunity to address the following issues.

First, education. We would like to insure that any credit union wishing to participate in the delivery of federal benefits has the opportunity to do

so. We are urging that the Treasury view credit unions as partners in a concerted effort to educate the federal benefit recipient population regarding direct deposit programs and other electronic access devices available within the financial services marketplace.

Our concerns are insuring credit union

Our concerns are insuring credit union members and potential credit union members understand that they can utilize their local credit union to receive federal payments through direct deposit and have the credit union provide them access to their funds in a variety of formats.

Credit unions offer products and services based on member preference as they are financial cooperatives and owned by their member base, insuring members access to their funds in the form that they desire.

We request that the Treasury not place restrictions on how credit union members access their federal payments because each membership needs are unique and should be designed by each credit union.

The New York League supports the

to bring into the financial Treasury's efforts services mainstream an estimated ten million Americans who receive federal benefits, but do not have an account at а credit union or other financial institution. We urge the Treasury to work with the New York League to draw upon the resources and the strong community connections credit unions have developed in order to raise awareness and market the EFT program effectively.

We would welcome the opportunity to work with the Treasury in designing a marketing and public relations campaign to inform consumers about direct deposit programs available.

Safety. The New York League agrees with Treasury's proposed requirement that all federal payments be made to an account established at an insured financial institution. All state and federal credit unions in New York are required to carry federal deposit insurance under the auspices of the NCUA and the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund.

Credit unions proudly maintain a healthy

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

insurance fund to protect their members' deposits with 1 2 an equity to insured savings ratio in excess of \$1.30. 3 support the Treasury's desire 4 provide a safe destination for these funds, as 5 historically you have indicated federal benefit 6 recipients have fallen victim to countless forgers, thieves, and counterfeiters, costing the government 7 nearly \$100 million annually. 8 9 The demographic breakdown of the payment pool indicated 90 percent of the recipients are SSA 10 11 and SSI payments. Of those 63 percent are over the 12 age of 65. 13 Credit unions historically have extremely successful in promoting direct deposit 14 15 services to their membership to insure safe delivery of their federal payments, with over 65 percent of the 16 17 member households nationally utilizing direct deposit services, and the usage increasing to more than 85 18

Credit union continually strive to educate their members on the benefits associated with utilizing direct deposit services and electronic

percent with members over the age of 65.

19

20

21

access devices.

Low cost service. Credit unions pride themselves on providing their members with low cost financial services. As not-for-profit cooperative financial institutions, credit unions provide low or no cost service to over 70 million Americans, including 3.3 million New Yorkers.

The cost to join a credit union by opening a regular share account, aside from the par value of a share, is nothing in 54 percent of the credit unions across the country, and in 45 percent of the credit unions it is a mere one-time charge of \$2.15, on average, with the most common fee being charged simply \$1.

The minimum deposit requirement or the par value of what we call a regular share account is traditionally \$5 and is set forth in each credit union's bylaws.

The low cost of membership makes credit unions an attractive financial service provider to potential members everywhere. As financial cooperatives, credit unions may only provide service

to members, and an individual may not have an account at a credit union unless he or she is a member. The only exception to this is in the case of our low income designated community development credit unions. These credit unions can accept a small amount of non-member deposits, but have regulatory restrictions capping deposits at 20 percent of total shares.

The New York State Credit Union League Board is comprised of 25 credit union CEOs from around the state and is the governing body of the New York State Credit Union League and affiliated companies. The board has taken an official position as follows: that the New York State Credit Union League opposes the imposition of ATM surcharges as an excessive and unnecessary charge placed on credit union members' and other consumers' access to the convenient and already cost effective service delivery provided by ATMs.

ATM programs within credit unions usually incorporate several free transactions and then a minimal charge thereafter. In the survey conducted by Booz, Allen, Hamilton & Shugoff Research on behalf of the Financial Management Service, two of the primary

reasons consumers gave for not having an account at a financial institution were, one, that they did not have enough money and, two, that the fees were too high.

Credit union regular share accounts are an extremely low cost alternative for these individuals. With the board of the credit union being comprised of credit union members, cost efficient service is always a primary goal.

Capacity to serve our members. In order to provide their members with low cost financial services, the credit union system has designed payment systems support the needs of credit to regardless of size and financial resources. Today we will hear testimony from Empire Corporate Federal corporate credit Credit Union, our union, supports a payment system infrastructure that services the needs of credit unions in parts of the Northeast.

Our credit unions support the corporate credit union network and rely heavily on the payment systems they provide to credit unions. These systems allow credit unions to provide their membership access

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to electronic services no matter what their size.

When a credit union grows over time through the support of their volunteer boards, they continue to support the system. This growth process takes years, as credit unions do not have the ability to infuse capital through stock offerings and rely on attracting deposits of their members and building capital from excess earnings.

Our smallest credit union in New York has \$37,734 in assets and has the ability to receive federal recurring payments if their membership desires this service through their corporate credit union. Our smallest credit unions are usually born out of need in areas where financial services are either difficult or too expensive to obtain. These credit unions reach a segment of the population that other institutions may not.

We as a movement have designed products and services to support all our credit unions and to help them in fulfilling their mission. For example, one of the areas Mr. Lewis manages is our ATM network CU-24. CU-24 has programs for the credit unions of

all sizes and serves New York, New Jersey,
Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and
Delaware.

Their agency program is specifically designed to make ATM service affordable for small credit unions. The agency programs offer turnkey support, allowing credit unions to have all of their back office support done for them.

CU-24 has contractual relationships with grocery store chains in New York and is currently working to expand these relationships across the region.

In the survey results done by the FMS, 30 percent of the federal payment recipients surveyed via the telephone indicated that they used the grocery store to actually cash their checks. This was second only to the utilization of financial institutions.

The ability to have ATM and point of sale services only enhances the credit union's ability to service their members when they desire electronic delivery of their funds. Allowing individual credit unions and corporate credit unions to compete in the

bidding process for federal agency status will significantly enhance their ability to service their membership and potentially meet segments of the population that others cannot.

Our philosophy. The philosophy of people helping people is the foundation upon which the credit union system was built. Credit unions provide products and services their members need at a cost that they can afford. We wish to preserve the consumer's right to choose the financial institution, as well as the delivery system that best services their needs.

We understand the challenges the Treasury faces in implementing the Debt Collection Act of 1996. We appreciate your effort to reduce the cost of processing federal payments, while taking into consideration the needs of these recipients.

We will support any effort that Treasury makes to involve credit unions and their supporting organizations within any phase of the plan to accomplish their mission. We have at our fingertips a wealth of information, surveys, support systems, and

credit union professionals who work in the spirit of 1 2 cooperation to provide our members and the American 3 consumers the information that they need so that they can exercise their freedom of choice. 4 In closing, we thank you for providing us 5 6 the opportunity to share our comments with you and 7 look forward to working with you in the future to provide federal government benefits electronically. 8 9 Thanks. Thank you, Ms. McCarthy. 10 MR. HAMMOND: Our next panelist this morning is Ms. 11 12 Dunay. Thank you. 13 MS. DUNAY: 14 Dunay, Director of I'm Lisa Quality 15 Assurance with Empire Corporate Federal Credit Union. On behalf of Empire Corporate and our 16 member credit unions, I would like to thank the 17 18 Department of Treasury for allowing us the opportunity 19 to address the proposed ruling. There are many questions and concerns 20 regarding the proposed ruling, especially with respect 21 22 the effect on the unbanked and the role and

responsibilities of financial institutions serving as financial agents for electronic transfer accounts.

As many of these concerns have been expressed by other members of the financial industry, I would like to focus my comments on the issue of electronic federal payments as it relates to Empire Corporate Federal Credit Union. My comments are intended to illustrate the strength of the credit union industry in the payment systems arena and our proven ability to efficiently provide low cost ACH credit services member unions for final to disbursement to the natural person.

Empire welcomes the opportunity to work with the Treasury Department and our member credit unions in an effort to automate federal payments.

Empire Corporate, federally chartered in 1977, is a \$2.1 billion financial institution serving over 1,000 member credit unions primarily in the States of New York, Rhode Island, and New Jersey.

Empire Corporate Federal Credit Union and Rhode Island Corporate Credit Union merged in early 1996. Followed shortly thereafter, Empire and Garden

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

State Corporate Central Credit Union merged in early 1997.

Empire is one of the largest and safest

corporate credit unions in the United States and is placed among the highest rated financial institutions nationwide.

Empire has 150 employees, staffing four office locations. Headquarters are in Albany, New York, with approximately 100 local employees. Branch offices are also maintained in Floral Park, New York, Warwick, Rhode Island, and Heightstown, New Jersey.

Corporate credit unions, as part of a three tier support system called the Corporate Credit Union Network, provide wholesale financial services to member natural person credit unions. Such services include investment, credit, payment, and correspondent services.

The Corporate Credit Union Network includes U.S. Central Credit Union, a financial institution for corporate credit unions, and 37 corporates working in unison to serve the needs of natural person credit unions nationwide.

A corporate credit union is completely owned and governed by its member credit unions. Much like natural person credit unions, corporates are not-for-profit cooperatives governed by a volunteer board of directors comprised of member credit union executives.

Empire has been providing payment services to member credit unions since its inception in 1977.

Our experience in ACH processing has generated particular interest in the management of federal agency disbursements.

Empire is currently provide ACH services to 355 member credit unions, processing approximately 350,000 ACH transactions a month. These ACH services include fulfilling the role of receiving point, sending point, and settlement agent for electronic entries.

In addition to the operational responsibilities, Empire also provides extensive education and training regarding the ACH network, not to rule compliance, risk management, and the policies and procedures government Empire's ACH services for

member credit unions.

Empire Corporate maintains a strong relationship with the New York Automated Clearing House, otherwise known as NYACH. Participation on the NYACH Committee allows Empire to vote on proposed NYACH rule changes and discuss issues relating to ACH processing with our members, other members of the financial industry.

Through joint efforts with NYACH, Empire continually promotes the use of electronic payments in the established ACH network. Empire's relationship with NYACH has allowed member credit unions of all sizes to accept ACH payments while they continue to offer low cost services to their members.

As a receiving point, Empire retrieves detailed files from NYACH. Detailed files are delivered to participating credit unions for timely posting to consumer accounts in one of several delivery methods. Empire offers host-to-host transmissions to a service bureau or directly to a credit union with an in-house data processing system. A software application is also available for those

credit unions preferring to receive files on the PC 1 2 platform. 3 Fax transmissions are even available for those credit unions with low electronic transaction 4 5 volume. Advice files are also received from NYACH 6 and forwarded for posting of settlement to the credit 7 union's Empire account maintained on the Corporate 8 9 Credit Union Network data processing system. Central Credit Union and the Corporate Credit Union 10 Network maintain an extensive automated settlement 11 12 system to facilitate the collection and disbursement 13 of funds required for various vendor relationships. This automated settlement system is used 14 15 to posted the Federal Reserve Bank ACH settlement transactions to the natural person credit unions' 16 17 corporate credit union account. Files are also forwarded from Empire to 18 19 NYACH for return ACH transactions and 20 origination entries on behalf of member credit unions, as well as for internal operational efficiencies. 21

Empire is also a member of PACHS,

private sector automated clearing house exchange. Though the use of the PACHS network, Empire realizes increased opportunity to minimize cost and reduce settlement risk.

Empire Corporate currently has three accredited ACH professionals on staff. Empire takes the knowledge base and experience of its employees very seriously and strongly supports the ACH accreditation program.

Empire Corporate has developed both the systems and the staff necessary to provide sophisticated ACH services to member credit unions. Credit unions utilizing Empire's services avoid the costs associated with direct connections to the Federal Reserve Bank or other ACH operators. Empire stands ready to assist member credit unions with education, compliance, research, and with various internal issues regarding their ACH operations.

The ACH operators also benefit from Empire's ACH involvement through consolidation of entries destined for credit unions, reducing the number of endpoints that require maintenance and

support.

Empire Corporate also provides ATM services to member credit unions. These services include a delivery system for the exchange of files with ATM operators, termination administration, and cash replenishment.

Empire Corporate supports the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 to convert federal payments to electronic funds transfer. We feel that credit unions can play an important role in providing accounts for the unbanked and accepting electronic transfers representing federal payments.

The corporate credit union structure is prepared and anxious to assist the Department of Treasury with the implementation of electronic delivery for all payments. We sincerely believe that the people helping people philosophy on which we are founded, coupled with the operational and technical strength of the Corporate Credit Union Network, makes credit unions the ideal alternative to perform the role of financial agent.

Credit unions by nature are service driven

organizations. The high degree of personal service
provided by credit unions makes them best suited to
serve individuals who do not currently maintain an
account with another financial institution.
The three tier structure of the credit
union industry is designed to support the processing
of large volumes of transactions in an efficient and
cost effective manner for credit unions of all sizes.
Empire appreciates the opportunity to
testify at this public hearing in support of credit
union involvement the proposed ruling.
Thank you.
MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Ms.
Dunay.
Our final panelist this morning is Mr.
Mirabal.
MR. MIRABAL: Good morning. Thank you.
Please let me apologize for being a little
late this morning. I relied on the obviously
unreliable Number 5 train to get me here.
(Laughter.)
MR. MIRABAL: I got stuck in the tunnel

for half an hour, but that's electronics. 1 2 No problem. MR. HAMMOND: We're glad 3 you're with us this morning. 4 MR. MIRABAL: Thank you. On behalf of the National Puerto Rican 5 6 Coalition, NPRC, I would like to thank the Department 7 of the Treasury for giving me this opportunity to 8 testify this morning. 9 I'd like to also submit written 10 statement which I'll summarize today. NPRC's mission is to provide for the 11 12 social, economic, and political well-being of almost 13 seven million Puerto Rican United States citizens on 14 the mainland and the island of Puerto Rico. 15 a special focus on the needs of the most vulnerable of our community, and we have been providing a voice in 16 17 Washington, D.C. for these concerns for over 20 years 18 now. We are concerned about the effect that the 19 20 EFT system may have on our community because many Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics receive some type of 21

government payment that will be converted to EFT.

According to a 1990 Census Bureau study, for persons 15 years of age and over, there were 1.8 million Hispanics receiving Social Security and 750,000 receiving SSI. Ninety-five thousand Hispanics were receiving at least one form of veterans' benefits, and Puerto Ricans on the mainland and the islands are major stakeholders in EFT, as well. There were 317,000 recipients of Social Security in Puerto Rico alone, and there were also 138,000 civilian veterans, of which 31,000 are 65 years of age and over.

In addition, 117,000 Puerto Ricans here receive Social Security, and a significant portion receives SSI.

NPRC support technological advancement and recognizes the need for this change, but we are also concerned about the impact this change could have on the Puerto Rican and Hispanic community. There are unique social, economic and demographic factors that affect the Puerto Rican community more than others, including poverty, limited English proficiency, limited education, physical impairing health problems, and single motherhood.

These problems also make many members of 1 2 our community more vulnerable to possible third party 3 abuses of EFT payments. To minimize potentially negative effects, 4 5 NPRC requests that the Department of the Treasury 6 consider the following major recommendations concerns in implementing this new system. 7 financial 8 The system's inability 9 address the needs of Hispanics; 10 The potential costs incurred by recipients through bank fees; 11 12 Waivers for vulnerable populations, 13 including individuals with limited English proficiency, limited education, physical impairments, 14 15 and single parents with children; The lack of culturally sensitive outreach; 16 17 The threat of EFTs developing into a more restrictive system, such as one that requires a debit 18 19 card to access your funds. 20 Recognizing that financial institutions will be major stakeholders in the implementation of 21 22 EFT, the future actions of Treasury on the issues

regulating EFT services delivered by banks, financial institutions, credit unions, check cashing, and money transmitters are critical to the well-being of millions of Americans.

There is a public policy issue here which Treasury shoulders uniquely and has the principal responsibility of protecting the rights of the most vulnerable of our society.

As EFT is being implemented, one of NPRC's primary concerns is in the inability of banks to do business fairly with Puerto Rican and Hispanics and other minorities. The most recent Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data found that within each income group for every loan type, Hispanics were less likely to receive a loan than non-minority applicants of the same income.

The Federal Reserve Board study in 1991 concluded that Hispanics are significantly more likely to be turned down for home mortgages regardless of income, and nationally 21 percent of Hispanic applicants were denied conventional home mortgages in 1990, compared to 14 percent for non-Hispanic white

applicants.

Recently in New York City, the home to nearly one-third of all mainland Puerto Ricans, over one million people, Congressman Charles Schumar conducted an analysis that demonstrated that the continuing failure of banks has not decreased; that they are failing to address the lending needs of African American and Hispanic mortgage applicants.

In 1996, 18 percent of Hispanics were rejected for a mortgage compared to 11 percent for non-minority New Yorkers. Rejection rates were even high for individuals with higher incomes.

Despite existing laws, such as the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the Community Reinvestment Act, which are designed to protect these populations, there clearly is no evidence to demonstrate that banks have a working system in place that will address the needs of the most poorest minorities any better now than they have done in the past.

NPRC recommends because of this that a commission be established to review the readiness of banks to serve this population and the possibility of

expanding the use of credit unions. The commission 1 2 should be institutionalized and be formed immediately 3 help monitor implementation and the 4 delivery of EFT. In addition, banks should be barred from 5 6 point of sale marketing and the selling of customer 7 lists for these new clients. Bank fees represent a hardship for Puerto 8 9 Ricans and other Hispanic groups and any poor who experience high levels of poverty and need small 10 amounts of funds that are delivered to them by this 11 12 new system. 13 In 1991, 36 percent of all Puerto Rican 14 families were living in poverty. The 1990 Census data 15 show Puerto Rican children had the unfortunate distinction of being the poorest in the nation, a 16 17 child poverty rate of 58 percent here in the States 18 and of 67 percent on the island. 19 Similarly, 24 percent of all the Hispanic 20 population was living in and at the poverty level. 21 The Treasury's provision of a bank account for Puerto

Ricans who do not have access right now, the unbanked,

is helpful, providing that they do not incur new costs in receiving their funds.

Those who are unfamiliar with the banking systems may not even be aware of the costs that they will incur. Most of our members rely on their income and will not be able to afford these fees, however small they are.

And, in addition, those who are unaware of their banking options may out of fear sign up for an account that charges exorbitant fees unknowingly. Bank accounts for these individuals should be free, we believe.

The Treasury should also consider setting up accounts for savings for these individuals. Such free accounts will go a long way, we believe, in preventing banks from actually looking for ways to increase or assess fees and will protect low income populations from being subjected to this form of economic hardship.

The implementation of the EFT will cause a problem for many Puerto Ricans on the mainland and the island as well because of limited access to banks.

Most Puerto Ricans on the mainland live in inner 1 2 cities, often in low income neighborhoods where banks 3 have closed branches or do not elect to do business. 4 On the island, a substantial portion of 5 the population lives in rural areas with even further 6 limited access to banks. 7 Therefore, NPRC supports the Treasury's decision to provide waivers to individuals who would 8 9 experience hardship in accessing bank accounts due to 10 geographical barriers. Limited English proficiency is another 11 12 potential barrier for using EFT to receive federal 13 It was assumed by Treasury that individuals payments. 14 with limited English proficiency could also experience 15 difficulties receiving a check. Therefore, they would be unaffected by EFT. 16 However, many of 17 individuals already are accustomed to checks and have no difficulty operating in a paper based society, but 18 19 EFT represents something very new and very 20 different. 21 For those who have both difficulties with

English and limited education, the EFT may pose a

significant barrier to receiving benefits. NPRC requests that Treasury reverse its decision not to provide a waiver for these individuals with limited English proficiency.

That's my beep.

Individuals with limited education are likely to be negatively impacted by EFT conversion of payments as well. Insufficient knowledge of even basic technology may prevent them from understanding how to access their payments. Most notable is the significant education gap between the adult and the young in the Puerto Rican community. Seniors are often the least educated and most likely to have cultural aversions to certain types of technology, including the EFT.

NPRC requests that Treasury reverse its decision not to provide a waiver for individuals with limited education, particularly the Hispanic elderly.

Puerto Rican elderly with physical impairments are the most vulnerable to third party abuses through the EFT system. Our communities suffer disproportionately from chronic illness due to

poverty, substandard living conditions, and hazardous environmental and workplace conditions.

NPRC is also concerned that intermediaries who serve the elderly and the disabled may also be assisting them with EFT bank transactions. There are no protections against these abuses that could take place as a result of an intermediary having access to their bank accounts.

In the event that an elderly individual is victimized by an intermediary, they must be fully protected against the unfortunate losses.

There should also be waivers for individuals who have physical impairments and are deemed legally disabled.

Family composition must be taken into consideration during the waiver process. The 1990 Census data revealed that 32 percent of Puerto Rican households are headed by a female. For single parents, there is a high level of stress on the family as it is. In addition, many poor women live in low income and often high crime neighborhoods where bank machines do not have a sufficient level of protection

for women living in areas where there is a high risk of crime.

We recommend that a special waiver category be established for single parents with children.

Culturally sensitive outreach and education is also important. Cultural aversions to certain types of technology and the mistrust of financial institutions, in particular, are both barriers for poor Puerto Ricans learning and using the EFT system. Cultural aversions to this type of technology, combined with language difficulties, pose a barrier to using the system and receiving their benefits.

It is also important to note that many of these communities may be difficult to educate and outreach due both cultural and language differences. Treasury should provide Latino community-based organizations and credit unions with funds to provide culturally relevant outreach to Puerto Rican and the Hispanic community.

Treasury should also conduct hearings in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

low income inner cities and in Puerto Rico.

Lastly, I would like to take this opportunity to add that we would not like to see this program evolve into a system where the EFT access card is used like a debit card, except that only by vendors who have EFT access, thereby limiting where individuals can make purchases and use their funds.

The New York Welfare Benefits Plan, for example, may force recipients to use debit cards. Under such a plan, recipients would not get the assistance they need. Many currently shop at thrift stores, yard sales, and other inexpensive markets that are not equipped to take any type of electronic payment.

Similarly, many merchants in low income neighborhoods would also be at a disadvantage. NPRC requests that the Treasury does not consider the implementation of a more restrictive system in the future.

I would like to thank you for providing me this opportunity to submit our comments on the EFT system, and I would like to offer our assistance as a

1	national organization representing the needs of seven
2	million Puerto Rican U.S. citizens in any way possible
3	to help smooth the implementation and protect our
4	community from the abuses and concerns that we have
5	listed here today.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Mr.
8	Mirabal.
9	I'd like to thank all of the panelists
10	this morning for their remarks. It was very helpful
11	as part of the process.
12	In order to start the process up here, I
13	have a couple of questions that I'd like to pose. The
14	first question would be for Mr. Coyle and Mr.
15	Warfield.
16	I noticed that in each of your testimonies
17	you mentioned a fairly substantial volume of payment
18	services related to utility payments, I think,
19	primarily that your organizations made. I wondered if
20	you could elaborate just a little bit on how that
21	service is offered or what that service comprises.
22	MR. COYLE: I can speak for Western

1 Union's, although I'm sure that Travelers Express is 2 fairly similar. 3 Western Union currently has a network of 4 agents in New York City, nationwide that contract with 5 utilities to accept utility bill payments at Western 6 Union agent locations. We contract with the utility to take a ConEd bill or a cable bill or whatever. 7 8 Those payments are held in trust pending receipt by 9 the utility. One of the notable features of them is 10 immediately upon delivery of the funds to us as agent 11 12 for the utility, the utility bill is deemed paid. 13 handle a huge volume in terms of dollars of that money 14 every year. 15 MR. HAMMOND: I realize it's offered through an agent location. Is that offered because of 16 17 the affiliation with Western Union or is it a service that the agent itself offers directly? 18 The agent itself elects to 19 MR. COYLE: 20 offer that service in addition to other Western Union

offered at all Western Union agent locations for a

21

22

services it may offer.

So it is not a service that's

number of reasons.

We're very selective in choosing agents that we think have the fiscal management capabilities to handle that volume of money, handle the trust fund issues and things like that because it's purely money coming in rather than a money in/money out situation where we can net settle with our agent and limit the credit risk exposure.

The important thing is that we handle the money on behalf of the utility and have got a perfect record in getting it to the utilities, as well.

MR. WARFIELD: As I mentioned in my comments, Travelers Express also has a vast retail base of over 44,000 locations. Our primary product is a money order product that's used by typically the cash based segment of the society to pay bills and other financial commitments.

We, too, have implemented in many of our retail locations the ability for these retailers to accept bill payments on behalf of the consumer. The money comes to Travelers Express, and then we remit payment to the utility or to the designated payee.

MS. DISMAN: Mr. Mirabal, when you mentioned Social Security checks in Puerto Rico, I have jurisdiction over the Virgin Islands, as well, in delivering Social Security and in the large number of Social Security offices.

I wonder if you can give me your suggestions for Puerto Rico itself in reaching the elderly population.

MR. MIRABAL: Well, they actually would be the same for reaching the Hispanic elderly population here in many of our cities. I think what many do not understand today is that half of the population is living in almost 24 states here in the United States. The problem with Puerto Rican elderly for the most part is that at least half of the 3.7 million people live in rural areas, having a very low level of education, and have almost no proficiency in English on the island of Puerto Rico.

The numbers get a little better here in the United States, but in both sectors, on the island and here in the States throughout our communities, there is a fairly big network of nonprofit, community-

based, service providing organizations.

In Puerto Rico alone, the last number of registered nonprofits on the island exceeded over 350 nonprofits in very many different areas, and many of them do assist the elderly and, in particular, elderly veterans who are on the island.

Puerto Rico happens to have the highest percentage by ethnic population of those members of our community who have participated in military service, and therefore, the number of veterans is high on the island, and they, of course, are World War II and Korean and Vietnam veterans at this point, and fairly elderly.

They can reached, but not through many of the established government systems, and I believe you do need to consider seriously the community based credit unions, as well as nonprofit community organizations, because of the fact that culturally there is an aversion to financial institutions.

Our organization does an enormous amount of work in banking, and one thing that continues to prevail as of today in the Hispanic and, in

particular, the Puerto Rican community is mattress money, where funds of incredible amounts are found in closets and in jars and are maintained there for fear of, you know, the evaporation of their funds if they place them in an institution.

So institutions, at least the kind we work with every day, don't necessarily get to that community and are probably the least capable of reaching them.

MS. DISMAN: Thank you.

MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Mirabal, I had a question related to your comments on the debit card based system, and I just wanted to clarify in my own mind. When you speak of a debit card, are you talking about a delivery device that can only be used where there would be, say, for example, a point of sale type of terminal, or would your comments include a card which could also access cash either at a point of sale, as well as at an ATM?

MR. MIRABAL: Most particularly ATM, larger network of cards. For those individuals who are able to work with that system, as I said before,

we believe that that is a positive step forward.

However, where fees may be involved in that individual going to an ATM machine, which is not their own banking entity, fees are often as high as \$2.50, and we do not believe that those costs should be passed along to the recipients as part of technology and advancement.

We can't make a decision for Treasury, but certainly one way to move toward allowing individuals to access their funds that way is to protect them from those fees by regulatory provisions or by making some specific additional funds available to cover those costs.

Certainly limiting where they can access their funds is not a solution to this problem because of the lack of these kinds of machines in our communities, and in many cases the infeasibility of their getting to these machines.

There are very few poor who own automobiles, who travel distances can to these machines if they need funds in an emergency, and in particular, single parents, who are a very large

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

component of our population, may have difficulty even 1 2 leaving the home, and that will create other problems 3 for them. So we believe that the most simplest way 4 of dealing with many of the particular issues is to 5 6 consider waivers. However, where the Treasury 7 believes that cards to access funds may be additional feature of this program in the future, we 8 9 do not recommend the issuance of debit card type 10 systems for accessing their funds. MR. HAMMOND: 11 I have one other question 12 for the panelists this morning. With regard to the 13 credit union networks, I know you mentioned the 14 capability of an ATM linkage through I believe it was 15 the New York League. I was wondering if you could explain how broad that may be within the region or how 16 17 many institutions and how many points of access that may provide. 18 19 MS. McCARTHY: Within specifically the 20 region here or the country? 21 Dennis, did you want to talk about that? 22 I talk loud, MR. LEWIS: Sure. Ιf

everybody can hear me.

Today there's 120 credit unions in New York State that offer that service to approximately half a million members, and there are approximately 500 ATM locations today across the State of New York where that access can take place, as well as probably 200 merchant outlets where that service can be utilized at the point of sale.

MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

MR. STAPLES: For Mr. Mirabal, the proposed reg. provides for a financial need waiver for the unbanked. Are you familiar with that provision and have you given thought to how that would apply?

MR. MIRABAL: Well, I'm not completely familiar with that provision. No, I'm not. I'm more familiar with the needs of the unbanked, and you know, if you have a specific question.

MR. STAPLES: Well, I would just point out that that waiver also is there in addition to the geographic waiver that was mentioned earlier. There's a financial need waiver specifically for the unbanked, and as was pointed out earlier today, these waivers

will be self-certified. So there is an avenue there 1 2 for the unbanked to request a waiver. 3 MR. MIRABAL: Can I just -- not being 4 completely familiar with what the definition of "self-5 certified" means, could you explain that? 6 MR. HAMMOND: Self-certification really means, as far as the drafting of the regulation, that 7 the waivers -- this applies to all the geographic, 8 9 physical limitations, as well -- that it's based on a determination of the individual recipient with no 10 other documentation or verification required. 11 12 essence, it's a self-assessment. 13 And so what may be a financial hardship for one may not be viewed as a financial hardship by 14 15 another individual even if they're in identical circumstances, but I think as Mr. Hawke explained 16 17 earlier this morning, we feel that the more user friendly the waiver policy is, the more broad appeal 18 19 the regulation has. 20 Well, then it would not be MR. MIRABAL: inconsistent to allowing a self-certified waiver for 21

single parents with children?

MR. HAMMOND: For example --

MR. MIRABAL: Or Hispanic elderly with limited English proficiency which are not now components of those?

MR. HAMMOND: Yeah, I think certainly the question of literacy and language, I think, would be different than the circumstance of a single parent, where you might then look in a single parent situation as to whether or not the geographic, physical or the financial waiver was more appropriate to that circumstance, as opposed to just dealing with a waiver based on household status.

Frank, I believe you --

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Mirabal, I have one question. So many of the issues you raise were similar to the issues raised this morning by Ms. Rice. As a program agency, we're really interested in making sure we get the payments, insuring that we get the payments safely to our beneficiaries, and while we want to make sure that happens with those that are unbanked, we also want to make sure that we get those that have bank accounts and make sure they receive

their payments safely.

Most of your comments concentrate really on the unbanked. I mean, are you supportive of the effort and are you willing to help us on promoting the effort for those that do have bank accounts?

MR. MIRABAL: Yes. I think in my comments I said we support the provision of an account for Puerto Ricans and Hispanics who do not currently have them. What we are concerned about are the number others that may have difficulties in dealing with that new system.

At last count, 51 percent of all working Puerto Rican families were working poor. They were working, but at the poverty level. It is the highest across the board number of persons in poverty in any ethnic group, yet they are working.

Similarly, on technology, only one in five Puerto Rican families is now interacting with the global technological system, and those families are the youngest of our community, not those elderly or other persons who might be more likely to be in this group of population that receive benefits through this

1 new system. 2 So we're concerned about the residual 3 number of people who are unbanked for those social, 4 demographic reasons more particularly than we are for 5 those who can function in that area, and it is not 6 meant for me here today to give you the impression 7 that we are not supportive of the system, and we are certainly prepared to help you implement that in a 8 9 most reasonable and user friendly manner that we can. 10 That's appreciated. MR. SULLIVAN: 11 I beg to make a statement. PARTICIPANT: 12 This meeting was so poorly organized and 13 advertised. My name is Andy Bowen, and at present I am the President of Statewide Senior (inaudible). 14 15 The people here represent organizations. They do not represent the people that you need to talk 16 17 That is, this is the wrong audience entirely to to. hear people's expression. 18 19 MR. HAMMOND: I want to thank --20 I only found out about it PARTICIPANT: Saturday. 21

MR. HAMMOND:

22

Well, I want to thank you

1	for your attendance, and I appreciate your interest.
2	If you'd like to make a brief statement this
3	afternoon, as well, we'd be more than happy to
4	accommodate you on one of the panels.
5	PARTICIPANT: We have a speaker on there,
6	but I mean, when you're getting into with Mr. Mirabal,
7	you needed to have another meeting.
8	I have no objections to this, but you need
9	another meeting that is more widely publicized so that
10	real grassroots people, not the organizational
11	representatives, will have a chance to look at you and
12	hear what you're saying and know what's going on.
13	(Applause.)
14	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. I appreciate
15	your comments.
16	If there are no other questions, if there
17	are no other questions for this panel, I'd like to
18	thank them again for their comments this morning and
19	their remarks. We appreciate your participation.
20	Based on the hour, I think that our best
21	course of events would be to recess for approximately
22	45 minutes. If we could reconvene at 1:15 and proceed

1	with Panel No. 3, that would be great.
2	Thank you very much.
3	(Whereupon, as 12:30 p.m., the public
4	meeting was recessed for lunch, to reconvene at 1:15
5	p.m., the same day.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

MR. HAMMOND: Good afternoon. I realize that not everybody is back from lunch yet, but I think all of our panelists are back, and we are anxious to hear what everyone has to say, and so in the sake of moving forward, why don't we begin?

Our first witness this afternoon is Gene Barrett, and he is the VOTE Regional Coordinator for the American Association of Retired Persons.

MR. BARRETT: Good afternoon, members of the panel and members of the audience as well.

I wish to thank you on behalf of the American Association of Retired Persons for having me here. My name is Gene Barrett, and I'm the AARP VOTE Regional Coordinator in New York City. I shall present our views regarding the U.S. Department of Treasury's proposed regulations to implement EFT 99.

Today I want to comment on hardship waivers. Hardship waivers are essential to assuring that many federal benefit recipients will not bear additional costs or burdens as a result of the requirement that federal benefits be received by

electronic funds transfer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

While AARP recognizes that EFT can enhance banking convenience and safety, the association did not favor mandating EFT for all recipients of federal payments because it could impose undue hardships on many.

AARP has a major interest in this mandate because it has significant impact on older persons. We are particular concerned about the adequacy of provisions to, number one, assist Social Security and SSI beneficiaries who currently receive their benefits by check to obtain waivers or sign up for direct deposit.

Two, protect recipients from paying excessive fees and charges to obtain their benefits.

And, finally, to inform and educate the public regarding their requirements and workings of EFT 99.

AARP is pleased to see that selfcertifying waivers for physical disability, geographic hardship barriers, and financial have been incorporated into the proposed rule. However, the association was disappointed by the Treasury's decision to deny hardship waivers based on mental disability or low literacy. We strong urge the Treasury to reverse this decision.

Given the vulnerability of recipients who could be adversely affected by these provisions, especially older persons, it is essential that the hardship waiver provisions have broad application and be widely publicized.

A report prepared for Treasury indicates that most check recipients are aware of the advantages of direct deposition. The reasons why they may prefer checks vary and depend on individual circumstances.

The major concerns of recipients about direct deposit include uncertainty regarding when a payment will arrive, problems accessing money if the account is frozen or under dispute or such as in the case of a divorce and the potential difficulty of resolving a problem if a payment does not arrive on schedule.

Also, many older check recipients prefer a tangible payment that they can personally manage,

while others dislike the idea of writing checks or using computers to obtain cash.

My own mother is a case in point. Now, my father died when I was quite young, only six years old. So my mother began receiving survivor benefits from Social Security for my sister and myself at a relatively early age. Since my mother had to work, each month it was my job to cash the check at the A&P. At that time the local A&P was just a corner grocery. It wasn't a supermarket. The manager would cash the check, fill my mother's grocery order, and put the change in a small bag inside the larger grocery bag, and I'd tote it on home.

Many years later after my mother retired, I was grown, of course, and she was receiving Social Security on her own. She still cashed her check at the local A&P. Only this time it was a supermarket.

In many ways she was a sophisticated woman, but she never had a checking account to my knowledge. She was comfortable with the envelop system that she developed over the years for paying her bills, and for her it worked. Evidently she

wasn't alone.

A plurality, 48 percent compared to 28 percent, of all federal recipients in the Treasury study object to mandatory EFT. Despite the benefits that may result from electronic funds transfer, a considerable number of federal beneficiary recipients will still endure a hardship if they are required to receive their payments this way. Besides those in isolated locations or those with impaired mobility or a diminished capacity to understand EFTs, others affected include those confused by debit cards or other electronic technology and those fearful or mistrustful of financial institutions.

These circumstances require a waiver policy that has broad application and can respond quickly and effectively to the very individual needs of federal benefit recipients.

I thank you, members of the federal panel, for sharing our concerns, and we look forward to working with you to answer the questions that have been raised here today.

MR. HAMMOND: I want to thank you, Mr.

1 Barrett for your remarks. I appreciate your 2 participation and your patience today with the 3 proceedings. 4 Our next panelist this morning is New York 5 State Senator Franz Leichter, and, Senator, if you 6 just wait one moment while get 7 microphone, the sound doesn't carry very well to the back of the room without it. 8 9 MR. LEICHTER: I am New York State Senator 10 Franz Leichter. I represent parts of the West Side of 11 Manhattan, and my district runs all the way into the 12 northwest Bronx, including Riverdale and Vancorklin. I've been a member of the senate for some 13 years and serve on the Committee on Banks. 14 15 performed numerous studies on how banks service 16 consumers, and I produce an annual consumer quide to 17 banks. 18 Let me thank you for being here, for 19 holding this hearing. It's certainly an important 20 I think you've gathered, as I look around at my fellow panelists, people who I think have a real 21

contribution to make in suggesting ways in which EFT

can be made workable for the public, and I trust and I hope very much that my comments and those of fellow panelists will be given due consideration.

My primary concern with mandatory electronic transfer of government benefit payments is the cost and convenience to the consumer. With bank account fees and ATM user fees climbing steadily, it is easy to see how recipients of government assistance could end up paying a significant percentage of their benefits to financial institutions just to maintain an account to receive their benefits.

My focus is on the poor and those of modest means, many of whom are seniors. We must make sure that the EFT system does not disadvantage them. Future regulations are required to spell out what the costs will be to consumers, but there is no assurance in the proposal as it is presently written that they will not be disadvantaged.

In New York State, the banks are required to provide basic banking accounts on which monthly fees are generally limited to \$3 and which permit up to eight withdrawals per month. This is a bill that

I and others have sponsored for many years and was passed some years ago.

I think it's worked, although compliance with the regulations governing this basic banking has not been as good as I and many others had hoped for, and there are many consumers who are still unaware that banks must offer such accounts.

I'd therefore propose that as to government benefit recipients with bank accounts in New York State or states that have similar such accounts, that your regulations require all financial institutions to inform the recipients of the right to have such an account.

As to government benefit recipients who do not have and do not choose to open a bank account, the proposed regulations require that special electronic transfer accounts be established for them. I urge that the regulations require these ETAs to provide inexpensive banking services and a network of safe, low cost, and convenience electronic access points.

Clearly the millions of dollars of savings expected for both the government and the banks should

not come at the expense of people who receive 1 2 They should end up being the government payments. 3 beneficiaries of these savings. 4 The waiver provisions that permit 5 recipients without bank accounts to continue to 6 receive benefits by checks are too limited. 7 other reasons besides financial hardship, many physical disability, and geographical barriers that 8 9 would justify a waiver. These include mental 10 disability, illiteracy, or inability to speak or read 11 English. 12 Because many individuals may choose not to have bank accounts for fear of creditor attachment, 13 the electronic transfer accounts being set up for 14 15 people without their own bank accounts should be exempt from attachment so that funds cannot be frozen 16 17 and payment recipients do not need to affirmatively demonstrate to the bank that the funds are exempt. 18 And, of course, I'm suggesting only that 19 20 the funds electronically transferred be so exempt. 21 There are many legitimate reasons why

benefit recipients resist electronic transfer. If the

1	government is going to require it, then these concerns
2	must be fairly addressed. I believe the adoption of
3	my suggestions would go a long way towards achieving
4	that goal.
5	I thank you.
6	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much for your
7	remarks.
8	Our third panelist this morning is Sol
9	Gorelick.
10	MR. GORELICK: If I may, I would like to
11	waive my position to Shirley Genn.
12	MR. HAMMOND: Okay. Our third panelist
13	this morning will be Shirley Genn with the Brooklyn-
14	Wide Interagency Council for the Aging.
15	MS. GENN: Thank you. Let me see if you
16	can hear me.
17	My name is Shirley Genn, and I am the
18	Executive Director of the Brooklyn-wide Interagency
19	Council of the Aging, and I sincerely appreciate the
20	opportunity to address you and the audience today
21	regarding the proposed electronic transfer of federal
22	benefits.

On my way in this morning, as per usual, I took the subway and suffered the same thing that many other riders suffer daily. There was a problem on one of the lines, and so there was an announcement trying to explain, and this is what I heard. "Yan, yan, yan, yan, transfer, yan, yan, yan, station," et cetera. I would like to draw an analogy from that to something that I'm going to discuss with you today, and that has to do with the communications skills of the Federal Register.

I looked at it very, very carefully and very, very closely. Number one, let me say that just in advance of that, as an institution that is supposed to be concerned with the public good, it appears to me that there should have been public announcements for some time in advance so that the public at large would know and if it so desired would be in a position to know the issues and to come here and also let you know what their feelings are.

In addition to that, I looked at how I could and other people could, because I contacted many people to let them know about this, and they said they

couldn't go, but they wanted to write, and then they 1 2 called me back and said, "There's E-mail." I don't 3 have E-mail. I don't have a fax. There's no address. 4 How am I supposed to give my comments? 5 (Applause.) 6 MS. GENN: Still others called and said, 7 "Look. I wanted to call, but I can't afford a call to 8 Washington, D.C." There should have been an 800 9 number. 10 So that last, but not least, in terms of 11 a suggestion about how one might communicate more 12 broadly and more effectively, since it deals with 13 federal payables, it would appear to me that every 14 federal payable check from here on end ought to have 15 something that deals with this issue in order to educate the public at large. 16 Brooklyn-wide is a consumer dominated, 17 educational, networking, and advocacy organization 18

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

local

represent 400,000 seniors residing throughout

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

interagency councils

Brooklyn-wide has been a major force in

composed

borough.

of

17

19

20

21

New York State, in cooperation with other concerned 1 2 groups in advocating for programs to improve the 3 quality of life for our elderly. The overwhelming 4 majority are low and moderate income individuals, and 5 this testimony addresses the concerns of 6 elderly, and disabled persons. 7 I am, of course, available to answer 8 questions you may have now or at some future date as 9 the need arises. On May 22, 1997, 10 Brooklyn-wide 11 similar testimony before the Senate Banking Committee. 12 At that time the <u>Federal Register</u> had not yet published its proposal on electric transfer accounts, 13 and newspapers were my primary source of information, 14 15 information that Ι gleaned plus some about demonstration programs in the South and Southwest of 16 17 our nation. Empire Corporate 18 After reading the Federal Register, I am 19 more disturbed than ever. There's critical 20 information omitted in the proposal to the public regarding the costs of those unbanked who receive 21

federal payments.

I contacted the Treasury Department to find out why the only reference to banked fees was "reasonable costs." I was told that the Treasury Department will determine the fees to be charged to the unbanked in consultation with the banks after, not before, the public hearings. In this agreement, it appears that the Treasury Department has determined that it is the fox in the chicken coop who should be negotiating with them to determine a reasonable fee for the most vulnerable in our population.

This is to your discredit as a federal agency, charged with the responsibility of protecting the public.

To compound your agency's duplicity in this matter, and forgive me for being harsh, but I feel very strongly about this, contracted banks will receive millions of dollars in payments from the government for providing this service. How many times must a bank be paid for this service?

Additional public comment is necessary on the process by which the Treasury Department will engage banks to provide ETAs as the final design of

the account. The Treasury Department should properly provide opportunities for extended public comment once it has determined how the ETA will work.

It is essential that the Treasury

Department require that ETA be affordable, genuinely

accessible, and available to any recipient of federal

benefit payments.

The Treasury Department's regulations gratefully include waivers allowing recipients without bank accounts to continue to receive benefits by check if they state that EFT would present a financial hardship or hardship based on physical disability or geographic barriers. We support these waivers and your efforts in this direction, but these waivers should be broadened to include additional waivers for mental disability, literacy problems, and language barriers.

These waivers should be available to all recipients regardless of when they begin to receive federal benefit. Recipients should also be permitted to request waivers if their situations change so that EFT would cause hardship in the future.

I'll briefly describe the unbanked population that I represent. After having worked all their lives, in the hopes that they could spend their last years in dignity, the elderly are being told to share the pain. With whom?

Typically people without bank accounts are poor. They live on minimal incomes, have limited education, and are unfamiliar with maintaining accounting records. In many instances language barrier exists. They barely subsist on the income they get from Social Security, supplemental security income, and other federal benefit programs.

The federal government is asking that this vulnerable population subsidize the government and banks? Is that a fair way to share the pain, a favored phrase frequently used by some in government charged with the responsibility of protecting the most vulnerable among us?

The federal government expects to save the Treasury about \$500 million over the next five years with its implementation of the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 by depriving seniors on social

security and others of the right to determine where their benefits dollars will go and charging them for the privilege out of their own meager checks. So the government will share the pain by saving its distribution costs and putting it on the backs of its most vulnerable populations, approximately ten million weak among us nationally.

With care not to have the banks assume any financial burden, the money will be electronically banked for all those too poor to have any bank history or experience. Without their consent, with limited and unclear alternatives offered, these poor federal recipients will now be given the privilege of sharing the pain with the banks.

The cost to seniors and others in this vulnerable population is expected to be \$3 monthly. This is based upon demonstrations that I reviewed.

In addition, the banks will generously charge them 85 to 95 cents per withdrawal each month after the initial withdrawal, and they will face an additional fee, in some instances two or \$3 per transaction if they have to shop at foreign banks and

withdraw their money there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I must also point out that while the banks readily accept the dollars put in, I have not seen legal safeguards to protect EFT customers. The Treasury Department should prohibit attachment of funds in an account into which federal payments have been deposited, should impose sanctions on banks that attach such funds, and publicize this provision to recipients.

Please be reminded that the financial benefits already enjoyed by banks will exponentially with the full implementation of this Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that law. responsibility to banks, in turn, have а communities from which they benefit. The nation's small depositors, particularly its elderly, disabled, and poor populations are entitled to some reciprocity. They banks use their money and then charge them fees for this benefit. Frequently the fees are greater than the small interest they may earn on accounts.

Because of the profits that banks make

without having to charge -- I had better put my glasses on. I'm one of those seniors, and I wrote something down and can't get to it.

Okay. Because of the profits they make without having to charge fees, it is reasonable to assume that the banks or the major institutions implement EFT at no cost to federal beneficiaries. With banks moving toward greater electronic systems and computerization, the industry is and will enjoy greater profits realized by modern efficiencies.

Entire segments of our economic society, including state, city, and private sector, are using electronic technology to distribute salary and payables. Electronic distribution of federal payments will infuse a profit boom for banks. It is reasonable to expect banks to use some of these profits to make banking more convenient and less costly for customers without whom these profits would not exist.

The proposal provides for no educational process until, I believe, late in -- the fall of 1997 and then in a more advanced way in 1998. It is now halfway through October. I have seen nothing about

any educational programs that would be helpful.

Education in banking procedures is totally foreign to this population. It is a slow process and must be implemented broadly at the earliest possible date so that the unbanked will be genuinely helped to transition into banking customers.

Our government agencies at all levels should be making greater demands upon our banks to restructure their regulations, marketing and educational activities so that low income consumers will be encouraged, not compelled, to be in the banking services mainstream.

about our unbanked seniors. Most are women living alone. They live in poor communities with few amenities. There are frequently no banks nearby. The elderly, if they can't walk, will be required to travel by bus. Most cannot climb the subway steps to and from the bank. If they are too frail or disabled, they have to pay for car service or taxicabs.

If they withdraw all of their money at one time, there's a significant chance they'll be mugged.

In addition to their physical plight, they'll have no money that month for rent, food, health care, the basics for survival. If they draw down, it means several trips per month with the attendant costs outlined above.

Please remember that their total monthly income is approximately \$600 a month. This sum must also cover gas, electricity, telephone, sundries, such as soap, aspirin, et cetera, clothing, and so on.

It is our shame as the wealthiest nation in the world that such regulations should even be considered. I implore you not to allow this injustice to occur. The financial and emotional cost is too great for America's seniors and its poor and vulnerable populations to bear.

Banks receive CRA credit for services to special populations. The poorest and most fragile among us don't have the resources or the ability to request assistance in establishing businesses or purchasing homes. They live from month to month on marginal incomes, unable to sustain any loss of income or increased complexity in meeting their financial

obligations. They should not be asked to pay any portion of this burden.

To the contrary, I have some suggestions on how to transition this special community into a banking mode. I propose that banks be required to initiate the suggestions I have outlined that I will read to you in a moment, providing these essential services to our neediest population, thereby fulfilling their community responsibility and be rewarded by receiving CRA credit, a little sharing of the pain for our banks.

The banking fees. I think all banking fees should be eliminated for this special population. There should certainly be an elimination of charges for foreign ATMs. There should be free and unlimited ATM transactions. They're minimal in cost to the banks, and they have saved I don't know how many millions because they no longer require the same staff to deal with these banking services.

There should certainly be eight check transactions monthly that they are allowed, and they should be compelled to disclose terms that apply to

their funds disbursed activities in a user friendly environment, giving clear and simple information on restrictions, reasonable penalties, surcharges, et cetera, for services on these accounts.

of security and terms consumer protection, they need safe and convenient access, sufficient numbers of ATM sites and bank branches within the community, simple access EFT replacements for lost cards, legal safeguards protect consumers from invasion into their accounts, and opportunity to contest notice governmental invasion into their accounts.

And last, and certainly not least, public Notices in large print and conspicuous education. sites in banks, ATM centers, government offices, senior centers, libraries, et cetera; informational notices with checks which I indicated earlier now being mailed out to recipients; brochures in banks and ATM centers; a disclosure of terms that apply to the additional services banks' in friendly а user environment; and ATM training machines for extended periods at community sites, such as senior centers,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

welfare offices, libraries, so that people do become 1 2 educated about how to use it and familiar with it. 3 And very last, but not at all least, 4 primarily is to have not a simple seminar with people 5 talking at people who are unbanked and totally 6 unfamiliar with banking procedures and how to keep There should be workshops on bank account 7 records. 8 record keeping for two or three months after people open up an account so that they can be taught how to 9 keep records without being overwhelmed and without 10 11 finding themselves at a deficit. 12 Thank you very much for listening. 13 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Ms. 14 Genn. 15 I would like --16 (Applause.) I would like to make two 17 MR. HAMMOND: 18 points of clarification or additional information at 19 this point. First is that by all means, we do welcome 20 comment letters, and if there's not an address in the packet of materials that's available, if you could see 21 22 someone in the audience before you leave or at the

table from the Financial Management Service, they'll 1 2 pass on to you the mailing address for sending in 3 written comment letters. 4 And in addition, it is the Treasury's 5 current intention to have an additional period of 6 public comment once the terms of the electronic 7 transfer account are announced. So there will, in fact, be another opportunity for public reaction. 8 9 MS. GENN: I assume that means that they 10 are proposed. 11 MR. HAMMOND: Right, correct. 12 MS. GENN: Okay. Just checking. 13 MR. HAMMOND: Our next panelist will be Mr. Sol Gorelick or Gorelick -- I'm sorry -- head of 14 15 the New York Legislative Social Action Committee. MR. GORELICK: Good afternoon. 16 17 First, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing. 18 is Sol Gorelick, and the committee of which I am 19 20 listed the head is the Legislative Action as Committee, Social Action Committee of the Brooklyn-21 22 Interagency Council on Aging. wide So you can understand why I yielded to Shirley.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I also am here as a Vice President of the Retirees Association of District Council 37, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

I'm making every effort to avoid duplicating other persons' remarks. Most of my comments will focus on the hearing process itself.

And one thing I note is that there are no banking representatives although their here, competitors in Western Union, Travelers Insurance, credit unions, they are here, and if the bankers aren't here, is it because they've already had their opportunity to communicate and negotiate with the Treasury Department and other government officials? I am inclined to feel that there has been such a process long before this hearing was held, and maybe that explains why no representative of the banking industry or any of the banks in our communities here in New York are present to testify.

They may be here. I don't know them all, but they're not testifying and facing questions from

you. So that's kind of strange.

In any event, it reminds me of the history, and it's sometimes helpful to look at history. I remember learning that in the founding of our country Thomas Jefferson was opposed to having banks at all because he considered that they were just a way of stealing money from the farmers or the gentlemen farmers who were the most dominant financial group, you might say, of the community at that time.

I also remember -- and that's during my lifetime -- that the government had to bail out the banks during the 1930 depression. So we have a history of an institution which does not mind accepting government help when it's necessary.

And as we look further at the proposal, we see that what's proposed so far or that's on the floor for discussion is, in fact, a windfall for the banking industry in three ways. One is, of course, costs to the government are reduced. We hope that is true, but costs to the banks are reduced because handling electronic transfer is much less expensive than having a teller who has to handle a check and the clerical

workers, et cetera.

So that's one source for the banks. The other source is being paid by the government for providing this system to operate.

And the third way is to charge the customers, both those who have already bank accounts and those particularly who are unbanked.

Those who have bank accounts already may be spared this additional cost, provided they keep the required minimum balance in their account, and I just checked on that last Friday in my own bank because I receive my Social Security benefits by electronic transfer, and they warned me that if my account fell below a certain level, I would suffer the same as everybody else who doesn't have enough money for the bank to earn enough interest to make it profitable.

So there are three sources for the bank. We call that triple dipping, and it doesn't seem very equitable.

Now, we know that new technologies are here. They're, you might say, unstoppable. They're not exactly an act of nature, but they are an act of

human beings in a social environment, and so we don't 1 2 want to stop it, but we want it to serve everybody in 3 a more or less equitable way. 4 So we're not opposed to the new technology 5 in the form of electronic transfer, but we do feel 6 that there should be more balance in the rewards. 7 Some people take your proposals, 8 Treasury Department's proposals, as another form of 9 corporate welfare. In other words, the government should provide subsidies or funding or easy access to 10 profit for certain kinds of institutions, but there's 11 12 not the same equal treatment of people and families, 13 perhaps a more equitable approach could be developed as you develop your regulations. 14 15 Getting back to the hearing process, you've heard others say that there should be more 16 17 hearings, and you yourselves have said there will be at least one more, I assume, in this area. 18 Am I 19 correct that that's what you meant about another 20 hearing? 21 MR. HAMMOND: No. What I meant, 22 Gorelick, is that we're going to have another period of public comment on the proposed regulations.

MR. GORELICK: I see. Okay. So then I'm restating my proposal, which is that this hearing be considered as incomplete until there is sufficient notice given to interested parties in this area so that the hearing can be continued with sufficient participation from various groups of the population.

As someone said it eloquently before the break, not just representatives of organizations, but a fairly representative number of people who are at the receiving ends of whatever new regulations are finally established.

As a matter of fact, we propose or we suggest that there be local hearings, and by local we mean community based, in the same communities where banks see fit to operate and make their profit. communities are the ones where residents of community should be able to participate with easy access to the hearing place, with sufficient announcements, and if any help is needed in developing these local community-based hearings, we would be very qlad help, not just myself personally,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Brooklyn-wide and the Retirees Association, and many other groups who would be willing to help in that process.

In fact, we feel that process is so important that if you don't it, we're going to do it, and we may not be as balanced in our presentation as you are. So may I suggest that you give serious attention to the matter of local community hearings.

And, of course, the hearings would then be in the appropriate languages for the people who happen to live in that community. So I'm adding Russian to that since in the community I live in and where Shorefront Interagency Council is located, Russian has become a very large use language.

Well, I want to thank you for the opportunity to present this, and I will put it in writing if that is felt helpful, but we are certainly prepared to be called upon to help you in whatever process follows this particular hearing. As I say, I hope it's only the beginning of the communication process.

Thank you.

1	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Gorelick.
2	MR. GORELICK: Excuse me. I have to get
3	back to my community.
4	MR. HAMMOND: By all means. Thank you
5	again for your time and your contribution.
6	Our next panelist will be Beth Finkel with
7	the I also need my glasses.
8	MS. FINKEL: I'll help you out.
9	MR. HAMMOND: The Executive Director of
10	the Manhattan Borough-wide Interagency Council on the
11	Aging.
12	MS. FINKEL: Close.
13	MR. HAMMOND: Close?
14	MS. FINKEL: Good afternoon. My name is
15	Beth Finkel. I'm the Executive Director of the
16	Manhattan Borough-wide Interagency Council on Aging.
17	I guess Mr. Hammond wasn't brought up in New York
18	City.
19	Okay. Please excuse my sore throat. I
20	will try as well as I can to speak loudly. I also
21	would ask your indulgence if part of my testimony is
22	repetitive, but I feel that some of the points really

demand underscoring. So please bear with me.

Manhattan Borough-wide Interagency Council represents both consumers and senior service providers throughout the Borough of Manhattan, and our mission is basically to educate individuals, consumers, those same senior service providers, elected officials as to the needs, issues, and concerns of older adults; to advocate for and with them; and to empower them to effect change by providing a forum where the members and the general public can meet and discuss and exchange ideas and information.

And just as an aside, we are doing for our next November forum, we are doing it on the electronic funds transfer. So we would very much welcome a representative from the Treasury Department or any other departments that are represented here, and I'll give you our flyers later if you'd like.

There are over 265,000 people over the age of 60 living in Manhattan, and an overwhelming majority of them are low to moderate income individuals, relying on federal and state benefits.

Over ten million Americans receive government benefits

currently that are without these bank accounts. 1 2 Among the elderly, this group is most 3 often financially unsophisticated. Some of 4 fragile and disabled. So how do we address their 5 issues in planning for implementation of electronic funds transfers? 6 7 We've all heard about that here, and I'm 8 just going to underscore those concerns that we all 9 have again. First of all, how will the low income 10 seniors afford the fees associated even with the basic 11 12 banking accounts? And what fees are going to be 13 applied? And how are we actually going to define, as my colleagues have stated, what reasonable costs are? 14 15 I think we probably need a separate hearing just on that issue alone, and as Senator 16 17 D'Amato had said earlier, and I don't know if everyone 18 heard this, he felt that there really should be no 19 fees at all for this population group, and our group 20 certainly agrees with that. 21 How will the elderly, who have never had

bank accounts, learn to adapt at this point in their

lives? And what educational programs will be implemented to help them?

We share the concern of Ms. Genn on starting these programs in 1998. We feel that that's a little bit late. You need to get on the stick a little bit sooner than that.

What safeguards are going to be put into effect to protect seniors from financial abuse? This is a very major issue for our population. We're concerned about the liability for caregivers, people who are going to be taking care of the seniors, who maybe at this point in time are not disabled and are not eligible for waivers, who are among the young old now receiving benefits. What happens when they reach the age cohort of the old old seniors? And then their needs are going to be different, and what is the waiver process when their situation changes? And how quickly will we be able to respond to those changes?

cards fall into the wrong hands? A major concern of ours is some of the safeguards that might be in effect for the federal regulations are not necessarily going

to be applied to the state regulations, and consumers are going to look at both of these benefits as the same, and it's going to be very confusing. They're going to assume that the liability that they have with federal benefits is going to be the same, and that they will not have the same penalties incurred.

If they send a neighbor out to buy their groceries with this debit card and then somebody steals it, is cracked with it, what happens? Do they lose their month's revenue? Are they unable to pay their rent? Are they unable to eat for the rest of the month? How are we looking at this issue?

What's the implication for guardianship cases? Maybe people are not in guardianship now but will be. What will be the availability, and the group said this before and this is very important to us, of debit terminals in local check cashing institutions, in the local bodegas, corner grocery stores? This is where many seniors in the inner city frequent, where they're comfortable shopping. We can't ask them to change their whole life styles because the government is changing the way we give out money. We have to be

sensitive to their cultural needs, and even more importantly, we have to think about the economic hardship on these stores which affects the local communities' economic development.

Because these stores have been in the communities for a very long time supporting the local institutions, the PTAs, the Little Leagues and you name it, and what happens? They were there when the banks all disappeared and when the major chain grocery stores were not readily available. Is this how we repay their dedication to a community?

We'll give you waivers not only for the disabled, but also for seniors who are confused or distrustful of banks. Other people have mentioned the mental disabilities, the literacy problems, and language barriers. These are all areas that we really need to look at.

And what would be a sufficient increase in appropriations for agencies that are going to have to deal with these waiver programs? Will there be an increase for them in the implementation process? Will there be more people available to answer questions to

consumers if they call Social Security or the Veterans' Administration? What will happen? People will panic, and they will start calling by probably the millions, and they'll need to get a response, and they're going to need people who can answer their questions. So will these agencies have the staff to provide that?

And then I'd like to get back to the issue of elder financial abuse. If a senior is afraid of penalties or afraid of having to pay extra service fees per month, they're more apt to withdraw their money once a month, and I probably don't need to tell you all that the local people, some people in the community, will know when the seniors' transfers are going through, and they will be prayed upon, and we need to think about how we're going to protect them.

Currently the New York City Department for the Aging has a pilot program where some of the local precincts escort seniors from a senior center to the local banks and back again. Some of this funding comes through Safe Streets, Safe Cities money. I would suggest that you might want to look at

1 increasing these funds so that we can expand these 2 programs. 3 And lastly -- if I missed this before, 4 please correct me -- will the Treasury Department 5 include public comments again before the final design 6 goes through? I know that this ends the end of the 7 year and your public commentary, and then you're going to go back into private session. Well, will it be 8 9 open again for a more public comment? 10 MR. HAMMOND: The answer to that is yes on the terms of the electronic transfer account, which is 11 12 the account to be offered to the unbanked. 13 MS. FINKEL: Okay, and I would also -- I guess I'd just really like to thank you so much for 14 15 opportunity of giving you giving me the 16 testimony, and it's our hope that the Treasury 17 Department will keep us in this process as advocates because it's real important. 18 19 thank you again, and I'll be 20 available for any future information that you might 21 need. 22 Thank you very much, Ms. MR. HAMMOND:

I appreciate your comments as well, and we, 1 Finkel. 2 too, very much share the concerns in particular about 3 the risk of seniors carrying around the entire 4 entitlement payment, benefit payment at one time. Wе think that is truly one of the areas where EFT can be 5 6 a true advantage going forward. 7 Our final panelist on this panel is the Reverend Joseph Washington from O.N.E., Organization 8 9 for a New Equality. 10 REV. WASHINGTON: Correct, and, Mr. 11 Chairperson and panel, I, too, would like to apologize 12 for my tardiness. I can't blame it on the train. 13 therefore, I'm going to blame it on the chef that took too long in the preparation of my lunch. 14 15 (Laugher.) The Organization for a 16 REV. WASHINGTON: New Equality thanks you for this opportunity to 17 18 testimony today regarding the profound 19 implications of EFT 99 on low and moderate income 20 communities, and especially the African American 21 community and other communities of color.

I offer this testimony in my capacity as

Chairman of the board of directors for O.N.E., the Organization for New Equity, and its national Community Reinvestment Network as a pastor to these communities and as a member of the community.

Let me begin by stating while the issues arising out of the move towards electronic funds transfer are numerous and weighty, this program represents an extremely promising opportunity to help those who are mired in the economic swampland to swim in the economic mainstream.

While we feel that the rules proposed by the Treasury are good and head in the right direction, there are certain areas we feel need to be revisited and/or revised. With such a program as this, having the potential to impact such a large segment of the population that we represent, we cannot help but feel that the analysis and implementation be anything but slow and methodical.

In an effort to be concise in my presentation, I will attempt to reduce our concerns as to the impact on communities and to some general points, with particular emphasis on certain

provisions. 1 2 One, the waiver provisions for payment 3 recipients; 4 Two, access to ETA accounts; 5 Three, characteristic structures of ETA 6 accounts; 7 And, lastly, public education campaign. Firstly, waiver provisions for payment 8 9 recipients. While the proposed rules lay out a general structure for the ability to obtain waivers 10 for EFT 99, it is our belief that they may not be 11 12 comprehensive enough to insure that all individuals with an account in a financial institution pursuant to 13 14 the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 will have 15 access to such an account at a reasonable cost and are given the same consumer protection with respect to 16 17 their account as other account holders at the same 18 financial institution. 19 Under the proposed regulations, Treasury 20 would only allow waivers to those persons with an

impose a physical or geographic barrier, as stated,

account prior to July 26, 1996.

21

22

If EFT 99 would

this would not allow for waivers to those individuals based upon an economic hardship, mental disabilities, literacy problems, as well as language barriers.

Moreover, waivers would not be provided to anyone who establishes or has established an account following the 26th of July 1999.

Second, access to ETA accounts. The rules as currently proposed will not allow those who currently have accounts with financial institutions or those who establish such accounts pursuant to EFT 99 to opt into ETA accounts. This provision seems to defeat one of the inviolate purposes of EFT 99, to promote the interests of unbanked into the economic mainstream where the use of the recipient's own voluntary account proves to be more costly or provides fewer protections than do the ETA accounts.

It is our belief that unless Treasury plans to regulate voluntary accounts established pursuant to the rules without the ability to opt into ETA accounts, payment recipients may face the prospect of paying exorbitant fees for unregulated accounts or may be effectively prevented from seizing this

opportunity to move into the economic mainstream.

Thirdly, characteristic structure of ETA accounts. The accounts currently being designed by Treasury to meet the needs of the unbanked must be structured such that the federal payment recipients will be able to access their funds conveniently, safely, at a minimal cost, and must receive the same protections as any other banking customer.

As previously mentioned, the act itself requires that recipients be provided access through EFT 99 at a reasonable cost and with the same protections as others. In order to accomplish these goals, the ETA accounts must have monthly service fees set at a bare minimum to insure that recipients are not forced to seek a waiver due to economic hardship.

Moreover, Treasury should seek to create an account that will provide the maximum number of monthly withdrawals possible. This, in effect, will help to encourage recipients to maintain money in their accounts for longer periods of time during the month, in turn providing banks with the opportunity to make a greater profit through the float resulting in

lower monthly servicing costs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Treasury procurement of the ETA accounts must also insure that adequate geographic access is provided and that direct access to funds through the vendor, the financial institution. While it certainly helpful for recipients to be able to access these funds in a number of facilities, be they ATMs, et cetera, it is more important that these recipients have the ability to access their funds directly from financial institution without the need the for intermediaries, such as fringe banker, meaning check cashers, rent-to-own stores, and the like, where excessive fees have and will be charged to recipients for access to their funds.

And, lastly, the public education campaign. The public education campaign announced publicly and in background to the regulations must be comprehensive and provide payment recipients with all information to insure that they make reasoned and informed decisions.

Treasury should only begin educating the public around EFT 99 and the ETA accounts when their

general characteristics have been ascribed to them and after the vendor procurement process has begun.

Further, should Treasury decide that the waiver of opt in processes for ETA remain the same, the campaign must inform recipients that once they sign up on the unregulated, voluntary accounts, they will no longer be eligible for either the ETA account or for a waiver based on financial hardships.

It should be clearly noted that both the implementation of EFT 99, as well as the public education campaign, must recognize the many options in educating consumers around EFT 99. Though Treasury has entered into contract with а national а advertising company, the department should not accept the traditional avenues of public education. They may not be adequate in reaching our communities and individuals where EFT will have the most substantial impact.

A number of possible alternatives would be to provide training through preexisting community programs, educational campaigns established by the consumer, the community, churches, synagogues, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

other public housing developments.

Though the implementation of EFT 99 can be positive, the government must be certain that it does not result through deficiency in either rules themselves or the public education campaign in the estrangement of a large portion of our nation's unbanked, low and moderate income communities from the benefit of a long-term relationship with mainstream financial institutions.

Once again, we thank you for this opportunity to present our views on proposed rules and look forward the final rules with the necessary changes reflecting the additional needs of payment recipients. Please feel free to call on us at any time to provide additional information.

Thank you.

MR. HAMMOND: Thank you, Reverend Washington.

To start off the period of questions and answers, I simply would like to pose an initial question directed at Ms. Finkel, but if others have thoughts on it as well, that would be helpful.

In particular, it comes to the question of you had mentioned in your testimony liability for caregivers, and I was wondering if you could elaborate on that a little bit and how that may or may not overlap with, for example, the representative payee program under the Social Security program.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ FINKEL: That was not the correlation that I was seeing here.

MR. HAMMOND: Okay.

MS. FINKEL: What I was thinking in terms of is with the high number of seniors with dementia or actual physical disabilities or even temporary disabilities, where a senior breaks their hip and they end up, you know, laid up at home for a long time and they end up with a caregiver for 20 hours a week, which is a very typical incidence in New York State, and they can't get out of the house to go take care of whatever it is they need to take care of, be it their grocery shopping or banking or whatever. What happens?

What are the processes that we're going to be thinking about in terms of liability here? What

happens with the caregiver?

MR. HAMMOND: I guess the question I have is if you can elaborate a little bit on how that might be different than in a cash or a check based situation and how EFT may complicate that.

MS. FINKEL: Well, I think I'm thinking about it in terms of maybe how the state benefits, which I alluded to in my testimony before, are not going to have the same liabilities in place that the federal already seems to have, which is that -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- that if the card is lost or stolen, you'll only be responsible for up to \$50; is that correct on the federal?

I don't believe that that safeguard is in place on the state level, and I believe the consumers will pay both benefits packages with the same brush, and first of all, it needs to be addressed at the state level, but I think you need to know about it and be concerned about it because, as I said, you're going to be painted with the same brush as the state benefits then, and people are going to be frightened of the liability.

1 MR. HAMMOND: Now I understand, and I 2 appreciate your concern. 3 MS. FINKEL: I'm sorry. I should have 4 been clearer on that. 5 MR. HAMMOND: No, no. You're absolutely 6 The federal benefits do receive protection 7 under what's called Regulation E, which the states do 8 have an exemption from. 9 MS. FINKEL: And, by the way, I do have to 10 add that even that \$50 is quite a steep liability for 11 a senior whose income might be five or \$600 a month. 12 So I think we need to think about that, too. 13 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much. STOUT: I would like to ask one 14 MR. 15 question to the panel. I think as we talked before, we focus a lot on the unbanked community, and it is 16 17 very, very important that we do that. I would just 18 like to get some reaction from this panel with respect 19 to that portion of the population which is at least 20 the same number or higher than those without bank accounts, who currently having a relationship with a 21

financial institution, but continue to get a check

from the federal government. What you think and what do you see are the issues that we're going to have to address and the barriers that we're going to have to overcome in order to move these recipients simply to adopt direct deposit. What are the issues and your perspective on that.

MS. GENN: I would like to address that. Thank you.

There are a number of seniors who have small bank accounts, and they have maintained these in sometimes their checking accounts, sometimes their savings accounts, and what has happened in some cases, people have come to me and said, "You know, I had five or \$600 in my account, and I really never had to use it. So I just kind of left it there, and I needed to take some of the money out for Christmas shopping," for example, "and when I went to the bank to withdraw the money, I had no money and my account had been closed out" because what happened was they had very little money. There are monthly charges that come every single month, and before they knew it their money had just been lost, and unfortunately because

we're talking about a very special population, either through frailty or limited education or language barriers or some sort of dementia or other problems, did not know.

I would assume, although I am not sure because they didn't know, that the banks did inform them, but obviously getting a statement from a bank is like the "yan, yan" I was talking about before. It is frequently meaningless unfortunately to the recipient.

And so I would ask that very special attention be given to this.

REV. WASHINGTON: As a consumer who has recently gone from getting my check in my hand to having my check directly deposited, it created quite a bit of anxiety because I always wondered was the money going to be there when they said it was going to be there. So I had to find out how to make sure that the money was there, and I began to call the bank, you know, through the computer system that they have at the bank that assured me that the money was there.

Now, for communities who may not have the wherewithal or the initiative to get through that, we

definitely have to have a solid public education 1 2 campaign. I believe that a lot of it has to do with 3 4 fear, and if people know that their money is going to 5 be there at nine o'clock on Friday and you can 6 convince them and prove to them that the money is going to be there, the likelihood of it being a 7 success is greatly increased. 8 9 So then Ms. Genn mentioned in her comments 10 that we have to be certain that we have a campaign 11 that teaches people. You know, this has the potential 12 of being something that's good. It will help you 13 manage your money and see where your money is going, but it will not help you manage your money and see 14 15 where your money is going until we do the necessary groundwork to make sure that people feel safe and 16 17 secure about EFT. MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Barrett, I believe you 18 19 had a comment. 20 Yeah, I agree with the MR. BARRETT: I think what you've got ahead of you is the 21 Reverend.

need for a very, very broad public education campaign.

When I first realized that I was going to testify 1 2 before this panel, I started checking around with 3 people I know, people in my church, things like that, 4 groups that I go to, and to find out what they thought 5 of this coming change and what they were going to do 6 about it. 7 I was more than a little bit amazed to find out that no one knew about it. 8 I mean this has 9 been just about the best kept secret at least in my neighborhood that I ever heard about. 10 11 Now, a lot of these people, I ask again, 12 a lot of these people still receive their Social 13 Security payments by check. My own sister who lives the same house I do, her and her husband 14 15 downstairs, they're both on Social Security. I myself have direct deposit. 16 both choose checks. 17 It's not that they're not sophisticated. They are, and they're not necessarily poor. 18 19 not wealthy. Neither am I, but they're certainly not 20 what we call near the poverty level. 21 The point is that you've got to start

telling people that this is coming or they're going to

be lining up at your door, believe me, next December, 1 2 20 million of them outside either asking for waivers 3 or asking for direct deposit applications. 4 You've got to tell them what their options 5 are, when the deadlines are that they've got to file 6 for either waivers or for direct deposition, and how 7 much it's going to cost them to choose any one of 8 these options. You've got to start doing it pretty 9 quick. You can't wait very long, I mean, because 10 you've got a massive selling job to do or you're going 11 to have chaos at the end of next year. 12 Thank you. 13 REV. WASHINGTON: May I make one more comment, please? 14 15 During the last session, a woman stood up and talked about notification. I consider myself a 16 17 fairly literate person, and I read a lot. However, I don't read the legislative record. I used to when I 18 19 was in government, but now I don't, and thank God for 20 Donald Graves who read it for me and translated it for 21 me.

But you're going to have a groundswell of

people to come out of nowhere in protest of EFT if 1 2 public education and notification isn't given better. 3 I took a poll, too, yesterday in my 4 church, and I told my congregation that I was going to 5 give testimony to you this morning around EFT, and 6 most of them thought it was some kind of extra 7 terrestrial --(Laughter.) 8 9 REV. WASHINGTON: And it is, and my point 10 is simply this. I think that my church represents a 11 nice cross-section of the American population, from high income to low income people, and if people in the 12 community and in the institutions that are regarded 13 highly in communities don't know about it, just think 14 15 about the other populations in our community. 16 Thank you. 17 MR. HAMMOND: We appreciate that. 18 I think one observation going forward is we recognize the critical importance of community-19 20 based organizations in the success of this effort, and I think that you'll find it will be an integral part 21

of the public education campaign.

I also wanted to make one other observation that came from the panel during the testimony as to the lack of bank witnesses in the panels, and I think it's fair to say that we are as perplexed as you as to why there is not more bank representation in the process at this time.

REV. WASHINGTON: Do they want to do it?

MR. HAMMOND: They seem to.

REV. WASHINGTON: I would think so, but, yo know, sometimes they say like it's too little money. You know, sometimes you go to banks and if you don't have but \$500 to open up a checking account, you can't open up the checking account, and since you're talking about people with \$600, I don't know if they would want to do it.

PARTICIPANT: You have spoken about caregivers. I have done that. When these caregivers only come 20 hours and the money is deposited automatically, you need to have a power of attorney to get this money out. You have not mentioned that at all because every time the caregiver came, who's going to go to the bank and make out a form for a power?

1	That is a very ticklish issue.
2	MR. HAMMOND: I'm sure. Thank you very
3	much, and I'd like to thank the members of the panel
4	this afternoon. We appreciate your time, your
5	assistance.
6	There'll be about a five-minute break
7	while we change over for the next panel, and I believe
8	there are some refreshments out in the lobby, as well.
9	(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)
10	MR. HAMMOND: If everyone could be seated,
11	we'll get started.
12	Okay. As I understand it, this is our
13	final panel of the day, and we have with us, I
14	believe, five panelists this afternoon, actually six
15	panelists I'm sorry to close out the afternoon's
16	events.
17	And let me begin with Hillary Botein, who
18	is the Associate Director of the Neighborhood Economic
19	Advocacy Project.
20	MS. BOTEIN: Thanks. Thanks for this
21	opportunity to testify on the Treasury's proposed
22	regulations.

The Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project, or NEDAP, is a resource and advocacy center for groups working on issues of economic justice and low income neighborhoods and communities of color in New York City, and I'm testifying today on behalf of NEDAP and also for residents of the low income red-lined neighborhoods in which we work.

the We'd like to commend Treasury Department for holding these public hearings, addition to accepting comments, because that makes the commenting process accessible to more people, and we'd also just like to join in with a number of the people who have said today that Treasury should consider holding hearings in low income communities consider holding hearings during the evening to make them more accessible to the recipients to whom these regulations will apply.

My testimony will focus on the proposed regulation's potential income on low income recipients of federal benefits. We're particularly concerned about their impact on residents of red-lined neighborhoods without legitimate banking services who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

too often have to patronize check cashing outlets and other fringe bankers in order to cash their benefits checks, and in addition, the senior citizen groups with which we work have been very worried about EFT 99 and the confusion and fear that could result, and many of them have testified today and we hope that many will submit written comments.

designed Τf EFT is and implemented correctly and attentively, it has the potential to improve delivery of federal benefits to low income recipients, and the system could also desperately needed banking services to red-lined low income neighborhoods.

The regulations raise a number of concerns. If these concerns aren't addressed in the final regulations, the income recipients of federal benefits will be at risk of not receiving their benefits, incurring exorbitant fees, and falling prey to the expensive and often unnecessary products and services that are offered by fringe bankers.

I'm going to focus on two of our major concerns today, and will address them and other issues

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in more detail in our written comments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Our first concern relates to the waiver provisions in the proposed regulations, and they've been touched on by other commenters today, but I just want to emphasize them again.

We applaud the Treasury's recognition that a waiver process is necessary for some recipients, and we agree that the waivers should be available to all recipients for whom EFT would present a financial hardship or a hardship based on physical disability or geographic barrier, but we also feel that the waiver categories and the group of recipients to whom they applied should be expanded in the final are regulations.

The final EFT regulations should include waivers for recipients who certify that EFT would cause them hardship based on mental disability, lack of literacy, or unfamiliarity with English. As other commenters have testified today, those people are very much at risk of losing their benefits if they have no chance to waive out of EFT requirements.

And we worry that Treasury and local

agencies won't be able to provide the extensive hands on and ongoing support that would be necessary for those recipients to use EFT.

We're also concerned about the provision that somebody mentioned recently that recipients with bank accounts -- and this is complicated -- who began receiving their benefits after July 26th, 1996, will have no opportunity to request waivers from EFT, and that recipients with bank accounts who became eligible for their benefits before July 26th, 1996, will only be able to request waivers in the case of physical disability or geographic barrier.

We think that the final regulations should provide that all of the EFT waiver categories apply to all recipients regardless of when they became eligible for benefits or whether they have a bank account or not.

The proposed three tiered system in which recipients are effectively penalized for having bank accounts and for becoming eligible for benefits after July of 1996 is simply not rational. There are many reasons why recipients might have a bank account and

still may not want to use that bank account in order to receive their EFT transactions.

We also think that the final regulations should specify that EFT waivers should be available and should be publicized to recipients at any time. For example, something that we see a lot is, given the consolidation of the banking industry, bank branch closings are happening very frequently, and they're particularly happening in low income neighborhoods.

Accordingly, a recipient whose local branch closes should be permitted to waive out of EFT at that time if the closing creates a hardship based on a geographic barrier.

And finally, we just want to emphasize how important it is that Treasury widely publicize availability of these waivers in different languages and in clearly worded statements. If recipients don't know that they have an option to be exempt from the EFT mandate, the thought and comment that have gone into these regulations and into the development of the waiver process will be useless, and many recipients will be at risk of losing access to their benefits.

The second concern I want to touch on is the design of electronic transfer accounts. I'm going to address Treasury's specific questions in our written comments, but I just want to touch on what we believe are the minimum requirements.

The account should be affordable, imposing no fees for a reasonable number of transactions, and minimal fees for transactions thereafter. As Senator Leichter pointed out, we're lucky in New York State to have a basic banking law that mandates that banks provide low cost checking services, but the law is very slackly enforced, and most banks don't publicize the basic banking services that they offer.

We encourage Treasury to take the lead on the federal level in the regulations by mandating that banks offer and market such accounts so that they'll be available to low income people across the country in other states that don't have basic banking laws as well.

As the federal government will clearly be realizing a tremendous cost savings through EFT, these savings must be passed along to low income recipients

in the form of low or no cost accounts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

be able Recipients must to use the accounts for transactions beyond electronic receipt of their federal benefits, such as writing checks, making other deposits, and making electronic utility bill If the intention of EFT 99 is to bring recipients into the mainstream banking economy, it makes no sense to provide them with an account that only receives electronic deposits. Recipients would then be worse off than they are now because they'd have to go to a bank to receive their benefits from their ETAs, and they'd still have to go to a bank or a check casher to buy money orders and pay bills. These features should be available at no additional cost to recipients.

The accounts must be accessible to residents of red-lined communities without banking services. Recipients must have the opportunity to obtain their benefits through a federally regulated financial institution rather than a check cashing outlet or other fringe banker.

In New York, again, we're lucky because

check cashers are regulated by the state. So they are unable to charge exorbitant fees or offer tremendously expensive services, like payday loans. In other states, however, recipients who are forced to obtain their benefits in check cashing outlets could be subject to tremendous fees, and will be left vulnerable to the abusive practices of fringe bankers.

If Treasury allows banks to link with the check cashing industry to provide TAs, it will once again fail to bring low income recipients into the mainstream banking economy. Furthermore, it will allow banks to realize a substantial profit or windfall, as many commenters have termed it, by receiving and transferring funds belonging to low income people without having to provide services in their low income neighborhoods.

Finally, the accounts must be available to all recipients of federal benefit payments, not only those without bank accounts as provided in the proposed regulations. If ETAs are properly designed, recipients, particularly those who live in states without basic banking laws, may be better off using

ETAs than opening a voluntary account, and recipients should be able to make an informed choice.

We're pleased to see that the preamble to the proposed regulations, and as you've stated today, Treasury will invite public comment on its proposed design for ETAs. We encourage Treasury to put this proposal into regulation form so that all elements of the account design are federally regulated.

We're also concerned about the procurement process for entities who wish to provide ETAs. Institutions wishing to take on the essential task of providing banking services to the unbanked should demonstrate their commitment to low income recipients and their underserved neighborhoods, and we believe that there should be public comment and hearings on the procurement process, as well.

ETAs represent a potential windfall for banks which should be required to provide a sufficient range of services to recipients in return, and we hope that Treasury will maintain its record so far, its impressive record, of receptivity to public comment throughout the ETA design and procurement process.

1	And finally, finally, as with our comments
2	on EFT waivers, we think that outreach and education
3	on ETAs will be absolutely critical. Recipients must
4	be able to make an informed decision about whether to
5	choose a voluntary account or an ETA. Treasury must
6	establish partnerships with community based groups
7	that serve recipients with federal benefits in order
8	to conduct an effective outreach and education
9	campaign.
10	Furthermore, Treasury shouldn't start
11	initiating its education campaign around EFT until it
12	has determined the characteristics of ETAs, as this
13	information will be the most essential thing for
14	recipients to get.
15	Thank you for the opportunity to present
16	these comments.
17	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Ms.
18	Botein.
19	Our next panelist this afternoon will be
20	Katharine Roberts, who I believe is a consumer
21	advocate.
22	Excuse me, if you could.

1 MS. ROBERTS: Yeah, sorry. Actually I'm 2 one of those people that seldom needs one, but I'll 3 use it. 4 My name is Katharine Roberts. I'm 71 5 years of age, and I am advocate for seniors, and as a 6 recovering mental patient, especially for those people with mental illness. 7 thanked you for 8 haven't yet the 9 opportunity to testify because it isn't your fault 10 It's only because I happened to see that I'm here. 11 Shirley Genn at a Health Committee meeting the other 12 night that I knew this hearing existed. 13 I do thank you, however, for letting me 14 speak. 15 I have changed my testimony quite a bit, and so you'll bear with me as I pop around reading my 16 17 very poor handwriting. 18 As I'm an advocate who participates in as many as five meetings a day and have in the last few 19 20 days, including Saturday and Sunday, I haven't written a very sophisticated report, and perhaps that's just 21 22 as well because other people have said perhaps much more eloquently some of the things I would have said today. However, I do want to read some of my testimony to you.

As I said, I first heard about this meeting Wednesday evening. I spent a large portion of Thursday phoning various senior groups and was astonished to find that few, if any, of them knew that there was such a hearing. How, if at all, was the hearing publicized? I don't know about the legality of holding a hearing that has not been publicized well in advance, but I certainly question the ethics.

I was very angry to find that to testify it was necessary to make a call to Washington. Like many seniors, my income is very limited, and I don't normally make toll calls even to my family, who live all over the United States and Canada, even including Alaska, I might say.

Why would a government agency hold a meeting in a site that is non-wheelchair accessible and where there are no hand holds at the seats when you have to walk down stairs in the auditorium? I don't think this matches the ADA very well.

Had I received the materials prior to the hearing, I would have changed my testimony even more and left out some, but I am going to continue.

and all recipients are required to have a bank account for electronic transfer of their payments, this will work a hardship in many ways. In New York City, there are very few banks which offer no minimum or special accounts for seniors. In spite of the fact that we do have the basic banking law, my bank, Citibank, does not have it and doesn't pretend to even know what I'm talking about when I ask about it, which is why my funds are now going to Fourth Federal.

There are many seniors who have never had a bank account, some of whom will not be capable of handling an account, especially those mentally ill who are decompensating or have always been in crisis.

To impose fees for the transfer of Social Security payments would be unconscionable. Even the smallest fee could deprive a recipient of bread or milk.

Banks make their money from use of

1 deposits, and EFTs are cheaper for them than 2 processing checks. Therefore, the imposition of fees 3 is simply outrageous. 4 Thank you for letting me testify. Once again, thank you, Ms. 5 MR. HAMMOND: 6 We appreciate your time and your careful preparation for this afternoon. 7 Our next panelist will be Melvin Faulkner. 8 9 MR. FAULKNER: My name is Melvin Faulkner. 10 the Chairperson for the Brownsville Ocean 11 Interagency Council on the Aging, as well as Community 12 Alliance for Youth Action, which is senior 13 transportation program. 14 am grateful to the committee Ι for 15 allowing us to come today to testify of things that we are aware of and maybe certain instances that the 16 committee may not be aware of. 17 18 We've been dealing with the banking issue 19 in the Brownsville community for eight years already. Long before there was a basic banking regulation, 20 there was a gentleman named Ed Prince that 21 was

putting this

instrumental

in

22

and pestering

legislative elected officials into forcing some of them to look at it in a hard manner.

Banks in our community have been really extenuating to the extent that they have caused us undue pressures to our senior population in the following manner. Already, not tomorrow, today, for an automatic transfer of funds from one to another it's more exorbitant than is check cashing. The bank charges, \$4 right now, today, for a money order. We can get it as low as 85 cents at the post office. The bank charges \$15 and \$20 for a certified check, when that isn't even worth a dollar.

These are the fees that we're talking about. In addition to those fees, we're talking to put money into our existing banks in our community. It costs money when we deposit. It costs money when we withdraw. There is an enormous fee for a monthly charge.

These things are undue pressure on our senior population already, and we haven't talked in terms of fairness in the electronic transfer situations. This is existing today. So where do we

go when we're talking in terms of electronic transfer of monies?

We've had meetings on this. We meet once a month. The people and the pressures coming out are what happens when the system breaks down. I go to the bank and say the system is down, electronically. What confidence does that give the senior who's bordering on the limits or the edges on how they feel about coming into a new system?

Our seniors, at least 20 to 25 percent of them, still prefer not. I remember the old days. There was such a thing as a depression. I remember the saving and loads folding, and the government had to bail out our banks, and they're saying, "Hey, I don't want to jump into anything unless I know it to be real."

This is happening today, and then again we have the less fortunate, the one who is not educated to the extent to say, for instance, "I can trust. I can see the vision." We have to deal with them as well, and they're saying to us on a daily basis, "How could we trust what we only hear to be failures? And

we need a proven track record because the banks come 1 2 into our community and they red-line the seniors as 3 well as the other population. 4 Since I am in a black and Hispanic 5 predominantly community, this is not made up. 6 factual. 7 Now we're going to come back to some of the things that they have to feel comfortable with, 8 9 and they feel more comfortable in the shoe box in the closet, in the mattress, below the bed, and at home. 10 11 They want to be able to touch their money. They want 12 to be able to have the mind that you can't take it 13 from me. I've worked for it. I've put it there, and it's mine to make the final decision. 14 15 some people have said, "Wait a minute, Mel. Don't give such testimony, "but I have 16 17 to give you what the people are talking to me about when we have our monthly meetings. They don't feel 18 comfortable. 19 20 And I say to you now we've already seen

you imagine what they're going to expect from us and

what the banks are doing before the electronic.

21

you in handling the money and the volume? They're not only going to come back and say the federal government owes us this. They're not going to say to the senior population and all those others that can least afford it, "This is going to force you as well."

Now, where do we come? Because I'm saying my community as a whole, and I speak on behalf of at least Brownsville, if not East New York as well because I've seen their testimony, similar to ours; we're saying why are the banks deserting our community. All I have is ATMs left in my community, and I'm saying what type of confidence, what kind of a prelude to things coming for tomorrow are we looking at today?

And, no, this is not from the paper that I have in front of me. This is from meetings, what we have discussed between seniors and the advocacy programs that are in the community.

And this arguing is effective, and in order for us to go back and maybe sooth and console them that this will be a successful program, we need some assurance that the banks that are not here today

will cooperate and make sure that they're not going to gouge the seniors the way they're doing currently.

I'm unhappy with where our banks are taking us so far today, and as Treasury, I'm saying to you it may be a savings to the government, but look at who's feeding the government. Is it not our seniors of yesteryear? Is it not them that made the prelude that led us to where we are today?

We owe them too much to do a double-cross, if you will, or to allow the banks to shift them any further. They need their livelihood. They need the right to make decisions on their own. They've earned that right. Everybody that has a Social Security check coming through the system has the right to say, "I can manage myself," and to the less educated, the ones that can't, remember there are families that have to step in to do the bank reconciliation statement on their behalf. We're saying suppose that second step is not in place. Who's going to do it?

And many of our seniors, and I have to acknowledge, may not be able to read and write and do a bank reconciliation statement. Who's going to look

1	after their things?
2	And we need to make sure that the
3	protection is set in place for them as well.
4	I thank you.
5	(Applause.)
6	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Mr.
7	Faulkner.
8	Our next panelist is Cliff Rosenthal, the
9	President of
10	MR. ROSENTHAL: Executive Director.
11	MR. HAMMOND: Executive Director.
12	MR. ROSENTHAL: I'm Cliff Rosenthal. I'm
13	the Executive Director of the National Federation of
14	Community Development Credit Unions, and I'd like to
15	thank you for the opportunity to speak on this
16	initiative.
17	Our organization was found in 1974, and
18	our mission is to revitalize neighborhoods and promote
19	self-sufficiency among low income people through
20	community development credit unions, or CDCUs, and our
21	job specifically is to strengthen the management and

financial base of these low income cooperatives.

Put simply, we exist because there are holes in the banking system. There always have been holes in the banking system, and as I think you hear today, there continue to be holes which may, in fact, expand in the banking system.

We specialize in bringing low income people into the financial mainstream by providing a safe, affordable place to save their Particularly for a low income person with no prior relationship to a banking institution, and there are many millions, as you know, the advantages to joining a credit union are significant, and CDCUs, specific, provide financial education and counseling. They provide the ability to accumulate savings and earn interest on those dividends or dividends on those They provide the opportunity to access savings. credit and to develop credit histories, and I might add in view of what you've heard, they provide the opportunity to get service from a real live person, not simply an automatic teller machine, as important as they are to financial delivery.

We have a membership of more than 150

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

community development credit unions across the United 1 2 States in 36 states, and the membership of these 3 credit unions, at a rate as high as 50 or 60 percent, receive public benefits either in the form of Social 4 5 Security or SSI or public assistance. 6 the impact of EFT 99 is 7 significant one for our member credit unions, which are located both in urban areas and rural areas. 8 9 both an opportunity and a challenge for community development credit unions. 10 toward electronic transfer 11 The move 12 benefits may assist low income credit unions in 13 expanding their membership and increasing 14 services to members in low income communities. It may 15 enhance their economic impact on those low income communities. 16 17 For some people, obtaining federal benefits through direct deposits will translate into 18 19 greater convenience and more likelihood to build 20 savings for these credit union members. 21 In cases where members already receive

payments through direct deposits, the benefit of a

safer, easier system have been considerable.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

On the other hand, the law presents tremendous challenges to all of us. The mandate of January 2nd, 1999, is an ambitious one at this point and gives us a little over a year to reach out to as many households as possible, assisting people who may never have had the relationship with a financial institution and, quite frankly, express frequently the feeling that they aren't welcome in institutions. those banking This is major transition we're talking about.

The emphasis on electronic delivery of financial services clearly is very, very important, but let us not lose the fact that this is also an historic opportunity to change behavior in the financial system; that if we do this right, we may be able to increase the numbers of low income people who are not simply transactors, but also savers financial institutions, and that is incredibly particularly time important, at when undergoing huge transitions in public assistance delivery in the United States.

It's not going to be an easy task considering the fact that we've seen a net decline in banking services, particularly in low income areas over all these years, and a disproportionately large segment of the unbanked population reside in the low income urban and rural communities that our member CDCUs serve.

So the need for outreach and education, as you've been hearing from other speakers, is going to be positively enormous over the next years. Households that currently don't have access to conventional financial institutions must be educated about the availability of alternative financial institutions, such as community development credit unions.

Electronic transfer accounts allowing ATM and point of sale access to benefits should be considered a short-term solution, not a permanent one, to the financial problems faced by low income communities. ETA accounts on their own will not provide the education and opportunity that a relationship with a credit union does, a relationship

that gives access to the ability to save and the ability in case of need to borrow.

Concerted efforts must be made to help unbanked households to open accounts, begin savings, and take advantage of the full range of services. date we find that the education and outreach at the community level, the financial institution level, and the household level have fallen short. The initial feedback from our member credit unions, which again are all located in low income communities, indicate to us that the preliminary EFT 99 materials focus more on banks than on credit unions, and we want to strongly step the Treasury Department to urge up efforts educational in the coming year through increased and consistent communication with like our credit unions. institutions institution is not synonymous with "bank" United States.

Multi-lingual materials must be prepared and must be made available to more accurately reflect the many cultures in communities that we serve. Announcements sent to households receiving benefit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	checks should include locations of financial
2	institutions, including credit unions, that are in
3	their area, and they should include contact
4	information, as well.
5	Finally, we, like other speakers, urge the
6	Treasury Department to involve community leaders,
7	churches and religious organizations, schools, senior
8	centers, as well as financial institutions in this
9	important outreach and educational campaign.
10	Thank you.
11	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Mr.
12	Rosenthal.
13	Now, we'll move to our final panelist of
14	the day, Ruby Sills and Glen Miller.
15	MS. SILLS MILLER: I'm here to represent
16	many organizations in New York State, not just in this
17	area, because it's a group of many thousand members.
18	PARTICIPANTS: We can't hear you.
19	MR. HAMMOND: Can you speak closer
20	MS. SILLS MILLER: Oh, that's right. I'm
21	sorry. I forgot this.
22	Many thousand members throughout the

state, but also avid organizations in the state, and 1 2 we have real concerns about this, and I will be glad 3 to talk about it after my husband has read the 4 testimony. 5 I'm asking him to read the testimony 6 because I have aphasia and at times I don't do that 7 very well in reading, and so I'm asking him to read 8 and I'll be glad to answer any 9 afterwards. 10 I'd add just my personal MR. MILLER: 11 comment to what Ruby said. 12 In 24 years ago, Ruby had her stroke. developed aphasia. 13 She lost her mind. She couldn't 14 She was in a coma for a few days. speak. She 15 recovered gradually. She had years of speech therapy and relief therapy. Now she's almost fully recovered, 16 17 but she still has a bit of a problem in reading out loud. So I will read her testimony. 18 "I am Ruby Sills Miller, President of New 19 20 York Statewide Senior Action Council, which is a 21 nonprofit, grassroots advocacy organization

individual older New Yorkers and of 100 organizations

of seniors from all regions of the state.

"Founded in 1972, Statewide has worked on issues of income security and health care, with particular concern for low income and vulnerable elderly. We are here today to comment on the Community Reinvestment Act, CRA's, proposed new regulations in relation to banking practices that affect low income elderly and disabled in our state.

"The CRA role in changing the services of financial institutions in poor communities is especially important for those elderly and disabled who do not now have bank accounts that would be forced to do so with the implementation of the Electronic Funds Transfer 99 law, affecting all payment, all federal payment recipients.

"We must remember that in spite of the known success of the Social Security programs to reduce poverty among the elderly, the problem has by no means been fully solved. In fact, more than three million New Yorkers over the age of 60, according to the State Office for the Aging, almost 350,000, about 11 percent, are living below the poverty level. The

median income for older women was only \$8,241 and \$17,862 for men. Of women, 90 percent had annual incomes under \$25,000, and 73 percent below \$15,000. Men fared a little better, but still 66 percent had incomes below \$25,000, and 24 percent below \$15,000.

"For over 550,000 elderly with identified

impairments, median incomes were \$7,474. Of those, 91 percent had incomes below \$25,000, and 80 percent below \$15,000.

still today "There are many seniors without bank accounts. Some are driven away by changes in the banking industry designed to get rid of small depositors. The disappearance of neighborhood banks in low income and rural communities and the personal services available there have not been replaced by ATMs. Traveling to even the nearest federally insured financial institution can create new dangers or certainly entail more cost, most especially for the very fail.

"Many advantages of new technologies are inaccessible for this population because they require costly touch tone phones or other special equipment,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

or actually present greater difficulties for those 1 2 with hearing impairments or the problems manipulating 3 the equipment. "While the New York basic banking law goes 4 5 a long way to deal with high minimum deposits and fees 6 for small depositors, its implementation is still inadequate, and it does not address the concerns about 7 the fees anticipated with the new mandatory electronic 8 9 funds transfer law. This will be a serious problem 10 for those whose monthly checks are already stretched 11 too thinly over more expenses than can be adequately 12 managed each month. 13 "We are, therefore, strongly urging the government not to require these low income elderly and 14 15 disabled to pay fees simply to add insults to their basic income. 16 17 "We also strongly urge that the regulation providing the CRA credits require the financial 18 19 institutions to address the needs of this special 20 population of low income elderly and disabled. 21 the recommendations "We endorse for 22 improved banking services put forward by the Brooklynwide Interagency Council of the Aging concerning fee policies, security and consumer protections, outreach, and public education.

"Statewide supports the goals of the CRA to expand community development opportunities and to remedy banking practices that have discriminated against poor and minority communities. We join with those who call for keeping the CRA concentrated on serving the poorest individuals of the in greatest need rather communities still than expanding to middle income levels.

"The banks should not be permitted to move away from credits based on serving the poorest. If the banking industry needs incentives also to meet middle income lending needs, that problem should be addressed separately. The government should not dilute enforcement measurements related to the core of CRA programs.

"In closing, it is clear that the banking industry will profit from the mandatory expansion of the electronic transfer of federal payment to the elderly and disabled. At the very least, we of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Statewide expect our government to protect the most 1 2 vulnerable among us, to make sure that these corporate 3 institutions also meet their personal 4 responsibilities. "We thank you for the opportunity to 5 6 comment on this very important feature." 7 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Ruby Sills and Glen Miller. 8 9 And once again, I'd like to thank all members of the panel for your very thoughtful and 10 thought provoking testimony this afternoon. 11 12 I think I'd like to start the post-13 testimony phase with just a brief question for Mr. Faulkner. I think, you know, in your testimony in 14 15 particular there was a series of personal insights as to the comfort level and the banking practices of a 16 17 large segment of certainly the community that you represent. 18 And one of the questions I'd have for you 19 20 is you had mentioned the need to establish confidence in the banking system in order to change the habit of 21

maintaining cash in a shoe box or under a bed, and I

was going to ask you to elaborate a little bit on how you think that confidence could be best obtained.

MR. FAULKNER: When you invite banks to come to seminars, to give seminars, educational forums for the seniors in your community and one out of eight banks show up, that doesn't instill confidence in the banking institutions, and when we contacted the banks on why, they came in with excuses.

Now, every year we take anywhere from 300 to 400 seniors on a retreat sponsored by one of our council persons in the community, and always we invite the banks to join such so that people could feel comfortable with issues concerning banking regulation.

Two years in a row they haven't even showed up. Now, this does not give us that confidence that we're looking for. These are some of the things, and you can't hide this because, in other words, at all our monthly meetings, in other words, there are issues pertaining to Social Security. We invite Social Security. If they apply to Human Resource Administration type questions, we invite them. the police or whatever it is, they always show up.

Banks, when we do have them, they come in with a tailored made program of what they're issuing, and when you have to look through an agenda of the 18 different types of things that they're going to offer, that's a problem, and that does not instill the confidence that we're looking for.

MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'd like to address this to Ms. Botein.

You mentioned in your testimony about the three tiered system on waivers, and let me start out by saying what we found as a program department as far as the EFT program.

VA issues benefit checks out to -- we make about 3.1 million payments a month through Treasury to our veterans. What we found is that on the EFT program -- and I will say that we had about 50 percent. We were languishing around there for a long period of time, and then we started inserts and started advertising EFT, and we jumped up to 65 percent, and what's interesting about that is that we had very little problems in terms of veterans coming

back to us on the EFT program. They didn't have any problems with the banks or anything like that, but the minor problems mainly were when you first put your account in and we may have been given a wrong number or something like that, and that was a start-up problem.

What's interesting about that is it look around a day to fix that for the veteran. When there's a lost or stolen check, it takes up to two weeks to do that.

So there's big benefits to EFT for those that have bank accounts, and I'd just like you to expand on what you meant by the problems with the three tiered program because we feel it's very important that we do make a distinction between those who have banked and unbanked.

MS. BOTEIN: Well, I don't know. There may be big benefit, and in fact, then I think there's people who wouldn't opt to waive out of EFT. It seems to me like it probably would be easier for Treasury, too, not to have a bunch of different categories, just to make the process available to everyone, and then

those who want it can waive in.

I think you're probably right. I think that probably the majority of people with bank accounts will opt to use EFT, but I can certainly imagine that someone might set up a bank account, for example, if their children are giving them money and they want to keep the money in that bank account separate, but they have an entirely different process for getting their check which they use to live on every month, and they go to the local grocery store and cash it, and that's the way they want to keep on doing it.

That person, if the person has any of the hardships that you're going to set forth as the waiver, should be able to waive out of it. It may end up being a tiny minority of people, but I don't see what the harm is in making it available to the people who are banked.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

MR. HAMMOND: I think that concludes our hearing today, and once again I'd like to thank everyone for their participation in the beginning of

1	the process as we go forward to implement this
2	statutory mandate.
3	I would like to remind everyone that the
4	hearings today were transcribed or will be
5	transcribed, and that the transcript will be
6	available. For those who would like to be mailed a
7	copy of the transcript, please leave your name and
8	address at the desk where you registered on the way in
9	this morning, and we'll make sure that we mail a
10	transcript out to you.
11	MS. ROBERTS: Could I make one comment?
12	I do hope that the next comment period will be much,
13	much better publicized.
14	MR. HAMMOND: Thank you for your comments.
15	We appreciate that.
16	(Whereupon, the public hearing was
17	concluded.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	